DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 869 JC 810 150

AUTHOR	Coburn, Judith; Colfer, Mary Ellen
TITLE	Needs Assessment for Child Care Services among Women in New York State Occupational Education Programs.
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Albany. Two Year Coll. Student Development Center.
SPONS AGENCY	New York State Education Dept., Albany. Office of Occupational and Continuing Education.
PUB DATE	Nov 80
GRANT	VEA-80-3F-961-GS
NOTE	118p.; Tables may be marginally legible.
AVAILABLE FROM	Two Year College Development Center, SUNY at Albany, Milne 229, 135 Western Avenue, Albany, NY 12222 ($5.95).
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Access to Education; Adult Vocational Education; Attitudes; Child Care Givers; *Day Care; *Day Care Centers; *Females; *Needs Assessment; Postsecondary Education; Student Characteristics; Two Year Colleges; Womens Education

ABSTRACT

This five-part report describes a study of the extent to which the need for child care services prevents women from taking advantage of New York's vocational programs. After Part I provides a project overview, Part II presents the findings of Phase I of the study, during which contact persons at 38 community colleges, 55 Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES), and five municipal school districts were surveyed to identify child care resources. This section describes community college child care centers with respect to purpose, population served, service capacity and eligibility, scheduling, licensing, facilities, center establishment, funding, staffing, and incentives and barriers to program continuation. Similar information is than presented for BOCES Child Care Training Labs. Finally, this section assesses institutional awareness of child care needs and interest in meeting them. Parts III and IV of the report describe the methodology and findings of the second phase of the study, during which current and prospective female vocational students with children under 12 were surveyed. In Part IV, after a demographic profile of the respondents is presented, major study variables (i.e., barriers to program access; use of, satisfaction with, and awareness of child care services) are correlated with demographic characteristics. Part V presents conclusions. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED198869

Needs Assessment for
CHILD CARE SERVICES
Among Women in New York State Occupational Education Programs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Mangano

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

JC 810150

Two-Year College Development Center
State University of New York at Albany
Albany, New York

NOVEMBER 1980

NEEDS ASSESSMENT FOR CHILD CARE SERVICES AMONG WOMEN IN NEW YORK STATE OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

VEA 80-3F-961 GS

Judith Coburn

with assistance from
Mary Ellen Colfer

Two-Year College Development Center
Gene M. Winter, Director

State University of New York at Albany
Albany, New York 12222

in cooperation with

New York State Education Department
Office of Occupational and Continuing Education, Special Programs

NOVEMBER 1980

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ELIZABETH A. BROWN, Chief
Bureau of Home Economics Education
New York State Education Department

BERTHA D. CAMPBELL, Associate
Bureau of Child Development and Parent Education
New York State Education Department

THOMAS J. CORRADO
Research Staff
Two-Year College Development Center
State University of New York at Albany

ANN GIBSON, Supervisor
Home Economics Education
Syracuse Board of Education

CAROL JABONASKI, Supervisor
Occupational Education Special Programs
New York State Education Department

SHIRLEY MANSON, Teacher
Home Economics Education
Columbia-Greene Occupational Center

REUBEN RUSCH, Professor
Department of Educational Psychology
State University of New York at Albany

LINANNE SACKETT, Associate Professor
Early Childhood Department
Hudson Valley Community College

ROSALIND SILVER, Supervisor
State Day Care Licensing
New York State Department of Social Services

COOPERATING SITES AND LIAISON PERSONNEL

REGION 1

ORANGE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Middletown, New York
Betty Johnson, Director of Admissions

ORANGE-ULSTER BOCES
Goshen, New York
William Calabrese, Director of Occupational Education
Arnold Naroff, Director of Continuing Education

REGION 2

MOHAWK VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Utica, New York
Julia R. Ramsden, Director of Student Life

ONEIDA-HERKIMER-MADISON BOCES
New Hartford, New York
William A. Izzo, Director of Occupational Education

HERKIMER BOCES
Herkimer, New York
Edwin Komendarek, Director of Occupational Education

REGION 3

GENESEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Batavia, New York
David Peters, Dean of Students
Kenneth Witt, Associate Dean for Community Services

GENESEE-WYOMING BOCES
Batavia, New York
Russell E. Glowacki, Director of Occupational Education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project was conducted with the cooperation and assistance of many persons whose efforts and ideas made its successful completion possible.

We are indebted to the site liaison persons listed on the preceding page for their cooperation in facilitating data collection at selected sites, and also to members of the project advisory committee for their expert advice and careful review of all questionnaires and interview guides.

Special recognition goes to Gene M. Winter, Director of the Two-Year College Development Center, for his invaluable advice and guidance throughout the project, and to Mary Ellen Colfer for her dedicated assistance in the final data analysis and reporting phases of the project. Special recognition also goes to Thomas J. Corrado whose statistical skills and contributions made it possible to program and process project data and to Norah Davis and Karen Dockal for the typing of this report and all other project materials.

To Nancy J. Howes, Assistant Professor of Educational Administration at the State University of New York at Albany, we owe a special debt of thanks for her guidance in the research design of the project's second phase.

We wish to express our appreciation to Carol Jabonaski and to Mary Ann Etu of the New York State Education Department for their continued interest in and support of this project.

Judith Coburn

* * *

Funding for this project was provided under
PL-94-482 Title II, Vocational Education Subpart 3F
Education Amendments of 1976
Administered by the
New York State Education Department

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT OVERVIEW 1

Background and Need 1
Purpose 3
Objectives. 4
Activities. 5
1. Phase One Activities. 5
2. Phase Two Activities. 9

II. PHASE ONE INSTITUTIONAL SURVEY - FINDINGS 13

A. Identification of Child Care Resources. 13

Community Colleges. 13
BOCES and Big Five City School Districts. 14

B. Description of Child Care Resources 15

Community Colleges with Child Care Centers. 15
Purpose of Centers. 15
Population Served 16
Availability of Services: Capacity and Age Limitations 17
Availability of Services: Scheduling 19
Licensing 20
Facilities. 20
Establishing Campus Child Care Centers. 21
Funding 21
Staffing. 22
Program Continuation: Incentives and Barriers. 23
BOCES Child Care Training Labs. 24
Purpose and Population Served 25
Scheduling. 26
Funding 28
Staffing: Professionals and Student Trainees 28
Transportation. 29
Problems Encountered in the Operation of the Training Labs 30

C. Institutional Awareness of Student Child Care Needs 30

D. Institutional Interest in Providing On-Site Child Care Services 33

E. Summary of Phase One Findings 36

III. PHASE TWO STUDENT SURVEY - PROCESS. 39

Population and Sample 39
Site Selection. 40
Analysis of Data. 41
Definition of Terms 43

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

SECTION PAGE

IV. PHASE TWO STUDENT SURVEY - FINDINGS. 45

A. Demographic Profile of Student Population. 45

Current versus Prospective Students. 45
Regional Demographic Profile of Current Students 53
Summary: Demographic Profile of Current and Prospective Students 56

B. Analysis of Major Variables. 59

Barriers to Program Access 59
Use of Child Care Arrangements 63
  Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Use . . . 67
  Particular Features of Child Care. 68
Satisfaction with Child Care Arrangements Presently Used 71
  Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Satisfaction 74
Preferences for Child Care Arrangements. 75
  Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Preferences. 80
Attitudes Toward the Extra-Family Care of Children 81
  Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Attitudes. 84
Awareness of Available Child Care Services 85
  Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Awareness. 88
Comparison of Overall Means for Current and Prospective Students' Use, Satisfaction, Awareness, Attitudes and Preferences. 90

C. Users versus Nonusers of On-Site Child Care Services 92

D. Summary of Phase Two Findings. 98

V. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS 102

SELECTED REFERENCES. 107

LIST OF TABLES

No. TITLE PAGE

1 Phase One - Institutional Survey. 9

2 Conditions Perceived by Administrators/Staff as Major Incentives/Barriers for Providing On-Site Child Care Services 35

3 Sample Distribution by Region and Site. 42

4 Comparison of Selected Demographics: Current and Prospective Students. 57

5 Use - Child Care Arrangements Used by Students Who Have Children in Specific Age Categories 64

6 Use - Regional Comparison 65

7 Use - Proximity to Home of Child Care Arrangements Presently Being Used
Use - Proximity to School (Current Students) or Place of Work (Prospectives) of Child Care Arrangements Presently Being Used. 70

8 Satisfaction - Satisfaction with Child Care Arrangements Presently Used
Regional Comparison 72

9 Preferences - Child Care Arrangements Preferred by Students Who Have Children in Specific Age Groupings 75

10 Preferences - Regional Comparison - Child Care Arrangements Preferred by Students Who Have Children in Specific Age Groupings 78

11 Attitudes - Attitudes Toward the Extra-Family Care of Children 82

12 Awareness - A. Perception of Available Child Care Services
B. Awareness of Available Child Care Services. . . . 86

13 Awareness - Regional Comparison - Awareness of Available Child Care Services 87

14 Major Variables: Comparison of Overall Means (OM) Between Current and Prospective Students. 91

15 Campus Child Care Service Users versus Nonusers: Comparison of Selected Demographics 93

I. INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT OVERVIEW

Background and Need

After a break in their education, increasing numbers of women are returning to school for job-related training. To become employable, women as well as men must learn new skills, upgrade current ones, secure requisite credentials, or move from one occupational area to another. On many campuses, special programs and support services have been created for women reentering education, the labor force, or both, in recognition of the problems of access that are peculiar to reentry women.

In order to improve access of women to job-related training and education, the barriers to participation in such programs must be identified and removed. Many reentry women lack the resources required to support themselves and/or families while in training. For women with dependent children, the financial burden of child care services, as well as the inability to secure appropriate and desired child care arrangements, has been identified as an additional or related obstacle which may be preventing them from participating in vocational programs that would improve their employability.

Recent federal legislation recognizes unmet need for child care services among adult occupational students as a potential barrier to occupational program access. Title II of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976, enacted to promote sex equity in vocational education, acknowledges that the creation and/or support of day care services for the children of secondary and postsecondary vocational education students may, in some cases, be a necessary condition for furnishing "equal educational opportunities in vocational education to persons of both sexes" (P. L. 94-482, Sec. 120 (b)). This legislation permits states to use portions of their VEA grants, in accordance with five-year state plans and annual program plans, to provide day care services for this population. The New York State Advisory Council on Vocational Education recommended to the Board of Regents in 1978 that where existing programs cannot meet the child care needs of students in New York State, funds should be made available, under Section 120 of P. L. 94-482, since "adequate child care is essential to true occupational equality for adult women."

The need for child care as a support service for adult students has already been recognized by many postsecondary educational institutions. In New York State, a survey of SUNY Community Colleges in 1978 revealed that local child care needs assessments and efforts to provide services are already underway on many of these campuses. However, more information is needed about the nature of these services and the extent to which they are meeting the needs of the target population. Are occupational education students who are parents currently using on-site child care services at the campuses where they exist? If they are not using these services, what are their reasons for not doing so? Where on-site child care services are not offered, what is the likelihood that they would be used by the current and prospective population if they were to be made available in the future? To what extent do unmet needs for child care constitute a barrier to program access for the target population, and would the availability of on-site child care services make a difference in a woman's decision to return to school? These are questions that need to be answered before State and local policy decisions can be made relative to providing child care services for the target population.

In determining whether a child care service or program will be used by the population for which it was intended, it is important to know the attitudes of that population toward the care of children, their preferences for particular kinds of child care services and their awareness of available services (Frost and Schneider, 1971). Some studies have suggested that the degree of adherence to traditional child-rearing attitudes is related to the extent to which parents are willing to entrust their children to nonrelatives outside the home. It has been observed that traditional attitudes toward extra-family child care in this country are "a formidable psychological barrier" to the utilization of child care services and programs, and that use of care in the child's own home and/or care by a close relative seems to reflect a reluctance to entrust the care of one's child to a stranger in unfamiliar surroundings (Frost and Schneider, 1971; Auerbach and Rivaldo, 1975). The extent to which this is true of adult women returning to school may have an impact on the use of campus child care services.

Purpose

The purpose of this project is to provide needs assessment data for State and local policy decisions relative to the feasibility of providing on-site child care services in New York State Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) and Community Colleges, and the potential impact of such services on women in occupational education programs.

The project was undertaken to assess the need for child care services among current and prospective female occupational students, with children under the age of 12, in New York State BOCES, Community Colleges and Big Five City School Districts; to investigate the feasibility of providing on-site, or campus, child care services for this population; and to determine the likelihood that on-site services would be used by the target population if they were to be provided. Project results will contribute to the achievement of educational and occupational equity by determining the extent to which child care needs present a barrier to occupational education program access for women.

Objectives

The project was conducted in two phases. In Phase One, a questionnaire was sent to all New York State Community Colleges, BOCES and Big Five City School Districts to gather information about: the present status of child care services, programs and facilities for each agency; administrative and staff perceptions of student need for child care services; the extent to which student child care needs are presently being met on and off campus; and agency interest in providing on-site child care services where these do not already exist. In Phase Two, 222 current students with children under the age of 12 at selected sites were surveyed by questionnaire, and 50 prospective students with children under the age of 12 were interviewed to determine: student attitudes and preferences for particular types of child care services; the actual child care arrangements students are using and their satisfaction with these arrangements; student awareness of existing on-site and off-campus child care services and their willingness to use campus child care where it is available; and student perceptions of child care needs as a barrier to program access and retention.

Through the Phase One statewide survey of educational agencies and the Phase Two in-depth student survey and interviews, the following objectives were accomplished:

1. A demographic profile of female occupational education students with children under the age of 12 has been compiled for current and prospective students at selected sites.
2. Perceptions of administrators/faculty/staff regarding needs of the target population for child care services have been described.
3. Target population perceptions of the extent to which child care needs are a barrier to program access and retention have been

determined.

4. Student and agency awareness of the availability of child care services, both off-campus and on-site, have been assessed.
5. Student attitudes toward child care and preferences for particular types of care have been described.
6. The child care arrangements made by students and their satisfaction with these arrangements have been documented.
7. The present status of child care services and programs at all SUNY and CUNY Community Colleges and all New York State BOCES has been determined and described.
8. Agency interest in providing on-site child care services, where they do not already exist, and the capacity to provide such services have been assessed.
9. The extent to which existing on-site child care services are serving the target population and the likelihood that current and prospective students would use on-site services, if these were to be made available where they are not presently provided, have been indicated.

Activities

In order to attain the objectives stated above, project activities were conducted within the following general categories: reviewing the literature; establishing and convening project Advisory Committee; developing and validating questionnaires; identifying population and selecting sample; making arrangements for data collection; collection and analyzing data; and reporting progress and findings.

1. Phase One Activities. In the first phase of the project, the statewide survey of all Community Colleges, BOCES and Big Five City School Districts was conducted to gather information about existing child care programs,

services and resources, about the target population's need for child care services as perceived by agency respondents, and about local agency interest in providing on-site child care services. With these objectives in mind, an Advisory Committee was established, consisting of content experts from the areas of sex equity, early childhood education, day care licensing and standards, and home economics child care training, and test construction experts from the State University of New York at Albany.

Project staff undertook a comprehensive review of the literature of general child care needs assessments, surveys of child care providers and surveys of child care efforts on college campuses (available on request). After the literature review, a questionnaire was developed to gather Phase One information. Based upon an awareness of some existing child care programs and services at the Community Colleges and at the BOCES, various forms of the questionnaire, appropriate to particular agencies and their offerings, were developed. From information gathered by the New York State Education Department, Bureau of Occupational Planning and Information and the Bureau of Home Economics Education and by the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Educational Services at the State University of New York, it was determined that a variety of day care, child care, early childhood and nursery education courses, programs, services and facilities existed at some of the agencies to be surveyed.

Many New York State BOCES and most of the Big Five City School Districts offer occupational programs designed to train secondary and adult students for jobs in the child care occupations field. A "child care laboratory center" is required for programs training personnel to assist in the care and guidance of young children. Over 60 percent of the BOCES offer such lab facilities, which include a group or groups of young children, generally recruited from the local community, to provide work experience for trainees in a fully equipped child care setting. Since the focus of these lab facilities is the training of workers, lab schedules are established to meet the instructional needs of students and staff, rather than the child care needs of parents in the school or community.

Unlike the BOCES child care labs, the child care programs that were reported to exist in the community colleges were established to meet the convenience child care needs of student/staff/faculty/parents. Some of these child care centers also serve as a lab for students in nursery education or child care training programs. Campuses with child care centers do not necessarily have a nursery education/child care training program, and those with such training programs do not necessarily have a child care center

As a result of this proliferation of child care services, programs, courses and facilities, the three agency types--BOCES, Community Colleges and Big Five City School Districts--were divided into categories according to the availability of child care services, programs or courses of study. The questionnaire was modified, as appropriate, so that information could be collected from seven categories of agencies.

The Child Care Advisory Committee met on November 7, 1979, at the Two-Year College Development Center, SUNY at Albany. At this meeting, project staff presented an overview of project objectives, activities and anticipated outcomes. Committee members were asked to review the survey instruments to determine the importance, appropriateness and clarity of each section and each item. The Advisory Committee recommended that items and/or sections of the questionnaires be retained, modified or deleted.

The questionnaires were revised based upon the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, and further refined following review by Charles DeVoe of the Information Center on Education, New York State Education Department (questionnaires available on request).

Questionnaires were mailed to contact persons at all SUNY and CUNY Community Colleges, all New York State BOCES and Big Five City School Districts. A total of 87 questionnaires were mailed, of which 72, or 83 percent, were completed and returned. Of the three agency types receiving questionnaires, the BOCES had the highest rate of return. Forty-two of the 44 BOCES surveyed, or 95 percent of the total in this category, were returned. For the Community Colleges, the return rate was 27 out of 38 or 71 percent. Of the five Big City School Districts surveyed, three questionnaires, or 60 percent of the total, were returned.

Table 1 below shows the categories of agencies receiving questionnaires and the contact persons for each category, and indicates the number of questionnaires mailed, and the rate of return.

Table 1

PHASE ONE - Institutional Survey

Type of Institution	Contact persons	# Mailed	# Returned	% Return
CC-1 - Community Colleges with child care centers	Child Care Center Director, Dean of Students or other designated individual*	14	8	57%
CC-2 - Community Colleges without child care centers, but with early childhood or nursery education programs	Dean of Students	6	5	83%
CC-3 - Community Colleges without child care centers and without early childhood or nursery education programs	Dean of Students	18	14	78%
B-1 - BOCES with "Child Care Occupations" course of study and training lab	Occupational Education Director	28	26	93%
B-2 - BOCES without "Child Care Occupations" course of study and training lab	Occupational Education Director	16	16	100%
C-1 - Big Five CSD's with "Child Care Occupations" course of study and training lab	Occupational Director or Home Economics Supervisor	4	2	50%
C-2 - Big Five CSD's without "Child Care Occupations" course of study and training lab	Occupational Director or Home Economics Supervisor	1	1	100%
	TOTAL	87	72	83%

*Contact person's name and title obtained from SUNY Central Survey of NYS two and four year colleges offering on-site child care programs, spring 1979

Respondents were, at times, individuals other than the contact person. In the case of the BOCES, the questionnaire was often completed by the Child Care Occupations teacher. At the Community Colleges, the Directors of Admissions, Directors of Continuing Education, Directors of Student Life and Sex Equity Project Directors also responded to the questionnaire. The data were processed and analyzed. Phase One data were used as a partial basis for selecting Phase Two sites.

2. Phase Two Activities. In the second phase of the project, 222 current female students, with children under the age of 12, at selected sites, were surveyed by questionnaire, and 50 prospective female students, with children under the age of 12, were interviewed to determine: a profile of current and prospective female occupational education students who are parents; student attitudes and preferences for particular types of child care services; the actual child care arrangements students are using and their satisfaction with these arrangements; student awareness of existing on-site and off-campus child care services and their willingness to use campus child care where it is available; and student perceptions of child care needs as a barrier to program access and retention.

Site selection was undertaken at the outset so that the population could be identified at each of the sites and the student sample chosen. A sample of three Community Colleges and three BOCES were selected to represent urban, suburban and rural regions in the State based upon Phase One survey results and other data obtained from the census and from the New York State Department of Social Services. The sites, located in three regional clusters, were:

Region 1 (Suburban)	Orange County Community College - Middletown, New York Orange-Ulster BOCES - Goshen, New York
Region 2 (Urban)	Mohawk Valley Community College - Utica, New York Oneida-Herkimer-Madison BOCES - New Hartford, New York

Region 3 Genesee Community College - Batavia, New York
(Rural) Genesee-Wyoming BOCES - Batavia, New York

At a later date, a seventh site, the Herkimer BOCES, was added to the Region 2 cluster because of a low target population in the Oneida BOCES.

Project staff visited each of the cooperating colleges and BOCES to talk with contact persons regarding data collection at those sites. Arrangements were made with Occupational Directors at the BOCES, with the Director of Admissions at Orange County Community College, with the Director of Student Life at Mohawk Valley Community College, and with the Dean of Students and the Dean of Continuing Education at Genesee Community College to:

1. Define the population of occupational education students with children under the age of 12 by distributing an initial screening survey form to all adult occupational students.
2. Select a sample of current students from the population so defined.
3. Distribute questionnaires to the sample of current students.
4. Identify prospective occupational education students with children who may be in need of child care.

The initial screening survey was distributed at each of the six sites. This survey was designed to define the population of current students, lay the groundwork for sample selection, and identify some prospective students through referrals (available on request). Prospective students were also identified through lists of reentry women who had registered for introductory courses at the Community Colleges and through ads placed in college newsprint brochures mailed to those in the service area.

A questionnaire to assess the child care needs of a sample of the current students and an interview guide to assess the child care needs of those prospective students who could be identified were developed (available on request). The Child Care Advisory Committee met on March 26, 1980, at the Two-Year College Development Center, SUNY at Albany, to review the student questionnaire and the interview guide. At this meeting, project staff summarized Phase One progress and results, and outlined plans for the second phase of the project. The questionnaire and interview guide were revised based upon the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, and further modified following the pilot test. A pilot test was conducted with 20 current and prospective occupational education students residing in the Capital District.

The sample of current students at seven sites was selected, and questionnaires were mailed directly to the students or distributed through the site contact persons, either in classes, at a campus child care center, or at a central distribution point on campus. A total of 519 questionnaires were distributed at the sites through these various means; 222 usable questionnaires were returned.

Contact was made with prospective students who had been identified through the screening survey, newspaper clip-out ads, and through registration lists for introductory courses. The names and addresses provided through the screening survey and ad responses were checked against local telephone books for accuracy. A letter of introduction was sent to all persons with listed telephone numbers whose names and addresses matched those already in our possession. These letters were followed up by telephone interviews 2 - 10 days later. The 357 names and addresses derived from enrollments in reentry adult introductory courses were checked against current enrollments. Only those women who were no longer enrolled in any college course or program were considered "prospective" for purposes of this project. A letter of introduction was mailed to selected individuals who qualified as "prospective" and for whom there was a listed telephone number. The letter was followed by a screening telephone call which determined whether the respondent had children under the age of 12. If the response was yes, then the interview proceeded. A total of 50 telephone interviews with prospective students was completed as a result of these procedures.

The data resulting from the current student questionnaires and prospective student interview guides were processed and analyzed to achieve Phase Two objectives.

II. PHASE ONE INSTITUTIONAL SURVEY - FINDINGS

A. Identification of Child Care Resources

In order to obtain a complete description of existing child care resources at the Community Colleges, BOCES and Big Five City School Districts, respondents were asked to verify and update the baseline data that had been obtained through the literature review. This was the data identifying child care services, child care training programs and child care facilities at particular sites.

Community Colleges

Twenty-seven of the 36 Community Colleges in the State University of New York (SUNY) and City University of New York (CUNY) systems responded to the survey. Of these 27 Community Colleges, 10 (37%) report that they are presently operating a child care center to meet the needs of adult students, while 17 (62%) report that convenience child care services are not provided on their campus.

A separate form of the survey questionnaire was sent to the 14 SUNY Community Colleges identified by a spring 1979 SUNY Central survey as offering child care services for the convenience of students, faculty and staff. Eight of the 14 returned this form of the questionnaire, all verifying that they were operating child care centers. Of the 22 Community Colleges in the other two categories (those who were assumed not to be operating a child care center based upon spring 1979 data, or those for whom information was not available), 20 responded to the survey, two of these reporting that child care services are currently available on their campus, and eight reporting that a nursery education/child care training program is offered.

BOCES and Big Five City School Districts

Forty-two of the 45 New York State BOCES and three of the Big Five City School Districts responded to the survey. Of the 42 responding BOCES, 27 (64%) report that a "Child Care Occupations" course of study is offered, while only 24 (57%) indicate that a child care training lab is available. Three of the Big Five City School Districts responding to the survey offer the "Child Care Occupations" course and two of these include the lab.

In addition to the "Child Care Occupations" training labs, other kinds of child care programs and services have been identified in nine of the responding BOCES and in three of the Big Five City School Districts. These are special-purpose child care centers or pre-schools supported by other-than-local funds and located in the BOCES or at elementary schools and "magnet schools" in the districts. The following is a list of these special-purpose child care programs:

- pre-kindergarten program for economically disadvantaged pre-school children (1 BOCES)
- pre-school program for handicapped children (2 BOCES)
- convenience child care services for adult students enrolled in CETA training program, using "Child Care Occupations" lab facilities, 3:30 - 6:30 p.m. (1 BOCES)
- nursery/day care, Teenage Parents Program (1 BOCES)
- home economics mini pre-schools, located in high schools, junior high schools and middle schools (1 Big Five City School District)
- Early Push and Follow Through Programs (1 Big Five City School District)

B. Description of Child Care Resources

Information was obtained from Community Colleges, BOCES and Big Five City School Districts about the nature and extent of existing child care services, child care training programs and child care facilities. Data were collected regarding the inception and purpose of such programs and services, the population served by them, their scheduling and enrollment capacity, funding sources, staffing patterns and physical plant.

Community Colleges with Child Care Centers

Although ten Community Colleges indicated that they are currently operating campus child care centers, only eight responded to the particular form of the questionnaire asking them to describe their services and programs. Most of these eight institutions operate child care centers that meet the child care needs of students, faculty and staff while serving as a lab facility for students in various college programs. These centers accommodate an average of 41 children in permanent facilities owned by the college and most operate on a full-day schedule. The first of the eight campus child care centers was established in 1972, with one or two more following each year through 1979. Two other SUNY Community Colleges are presently in the process of establishing on-site child care centers.

Five of the existing centers are licensed by the New York State Department of Social Services (NYSDSS), and three are neither licensed by NYSDSS nor registered with the New York State Education Department.

Purpose of Centers. All eight Community Colleges described as their center's primary purpose the provision of convenient child care for the children of students, faculty and staff. One explained that they wished to "draw students who might otherwise not be able to return to school." Another respondent emphasized the developmental/educational needs of children as well as the convenience of parents, in describing the desire to provide "good quality child care in an educationally sound environment to children of students." The emphasis on quality child care is reinforced by the prevalence of cooperative arrangements with academic departments in the Community Colleges. Three of the Community College respondents indicated that the training of students in child care occupations is an additional purpose of their child care centers; two described their centers as serving as a lab facility for early childhood courses and programs; and one respondent explained that their center provided observation experiences for Human Services classes.

The name by which each of the campus child care centers is known serves as an additional indication of purpose. Two of the programs use the term "Learning Center," six are called "Day Care Center" or "Child Care Center" and one is entitled "Fun and Learn Child Care Center."

Population Served. An effort was made to determine how many of the student parents actually using the campus child care services are enrolled in occupational education programs, how many are single heads of household, how many are female and how many male. Seven of the Community Colleges provided estimates regarding these categories of student users; one had no data available. Six respondents reported a total of 64 female single heads of household, or an average of 10.6 per school using the on-site child care center. Three schools identified a total of 20 fathers who are single heads of household, or an average of 6.6 per school who are users of the center. Three schools estimated that a total of 48 of the female users of child care services are students enrolled in occupational education programs; and two schools estimated a total of 44 male users who are occupational students.

Three respondents estimated that there are a total of 22 students using their child care centers who are female single heads of households enrolled in occupational education programs. One school reported that 43 female students were using their center, but did not report the number of occupational education students or single parents.

Five of the eight responding Community Colleges in this category reported that they are aware of specific students enrolled in occupational education programs, or groups of such students, whose child care needs are not being met by the campus child care center. Reasons for this include the following:

- the on-site child care center is not open during the evening hours when many occupational education classes meet (3 schools)
- the center's capacity is not great enough to meet the demand from occupational students (3 schools)
- students travel long distances to school and often prefer child care arrangements located close to home (1 school)
- full-day operation of center is needed by nursing students and is currently not available (1 school)

Availability of Services: Capacity and Age Limitations. Availability of campus child care services that will meet the child care needs of adult students is determined not only by the existence of such services and by the hours of service, but also by the number of children who can be served at any given time and by the age groups that a center is willing to serve.

A frequent complaint by parents seeking child care arrangements is that center-based care focuses on the three to five-year old and tends not to accommodate either infants and toddlers or older school-age children.

All eight of the Community Colleges providing a description of their child care centers are serving children three to five years of age. One facility accommodates infants through five year olds. Three serve children 18 months to five years of age. One serves children 18 months of age through school age. One serves children three to five years of age only, and two serve children ages three through school age. These data reveal that only one center is presently serving children under 18 months and only three accommodate school-aged children. Respondents were asked if they would consider the possibility of accommodating additional age groups not presently served. Two of the schools responded that they would consider accommodating children 18 months to three years of age, and one school indicated it would consider including school-aged children. The remaining five colleges responded negatively to this consideration. Five listed space limitations as their reason for ruling out the possibility. Two pointed to stringent licensing requirements for the care of children under three and the consequent need to modify the facility and staffing ratio for relicensing. One cited cost as the inhibiting factor: "We have determined that it is too expensive to provide good quality infant care. After-school care would necessitate materials we do not have. We are concerned with maintaining quality care for the ages we presently serve."

The following chart indicates the numbers of children served in each age category by the eight campus child care centers. It does not indicate capacity, or numbers that a center is licensed to serve, but rather numbers actually enrolled.

Eight Campus Child Care Centers

Age groups served	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Under 18 months	15							
18 months - 3 years	19	1	3	24	3			
3 - 5 years	30	8	22	34	28	46	34	39
School age (including kindergarten)	0				4		5	4
Totals served	64	9	25	58	35	46	39	43

The campus child care centers are capable of serving 13 to 60 children per session, with an average capacity of 28 children per session. For some, these capacities represent space limitations, for others they are limits imposed by licensing requirements. With present physical resources and staff, two schools estimate that they are filled to capacity. Two centers report that they can accommodate up to 5 more children, one center can accommodate an additional 6-10 children, another center reports 16-20 empty slots, while still another center estimates it can serve at least 20 additional children. Two respondents indicate that they might be able to serve more children depending upon the time of day, age of child and other factors.

Availability of Services: Scheduling. Most of the responding Community Colleges operating child care centers maintain a full day schedule. These centers open between 7:30 a.m. and 8:30 a.m. and close between 3:30 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. Two of these child care centers stipulate a two-hour minimum attendance period per day, and one has established a three-hour daily maximum attendance. At one campus child care center, where children had been permitted to attend for any length of time while their parents attended classes, a new minimum attendance requirement of 10 hours per week has been established.

Although many adult students attend evening classes, none of the campus child care centers surveyed were open during the evening. In response to a question concerning the possibility of extending the available scheduling at their center to include evening class hours, six of the responding schools indicated that they would be willing to consider doing this, while two said they would not. Four respondents qualified their responses, providing some insight into the reasons for hesitating to offer evening child care. One respondent stated that sitters are generally "more available in the evening" and the college would only consider evening child care "if needed." Another echoed this response, stating that they would consider offering evening child care "_if_ the need arises." They added, "We did a survey of evening students two years ago, and we found no need to extend day care operational services." One respondent ruled out evening child care sessions due to "inadequate space," and another pointed out that "the State regulations for evening care are very strict and complying with them would be very expensive."

Licensing. Licensing requirements for child care centers are generally tied to physical facilities, number of children served, ages of children served and staff/child ratio. If a center is not licensed, then a parent using its services cannot be reimbursed by county Departments of Social Services under Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) or Title XX.

Five of the eight on-site Community College child care centers are licensed by the New York State Department of Social Services (NYSDSS). Three of the centers are neither licensed by NYSDSS nor registered with the New York State Education Department.

Facilities. The majority of the campus child care centers are located in permanent, on-campus facilities, owned by the Community Colleges. One college rents a temporary facility on campus, another rents an off-campus facility to house their child care services.

Four of the colleges consider their child care facility inadequate to meet present needs; three rate their facility as adequate (one school did not respond). More space is needed by three of the centers so that they can expand to meet the needs of students currently requesting child care. One school has no available space on campus and one of the colleges anticipated that the facility used by their child care center may revert to use as a lounge for dormitory students.

Establishing Campus Child Care Centers. The impetus for establishing the Community College child care centers came from a variety of sources, including: administration; faculty; students; administration and faculty combined; administration and students combined; and faculty, students and administration combined.

Beginning in 1972 and continuing to the present, the perception of local need for on-site child care services at the Community Colleges has led to action taken by the groups listed above to establish campus child care centers.

Three of the eight child care centers responding to the survey are operated under the auspices of an association or not-for-profit corporation. The remaining programs are under the auspices of the Office of Community Education (1), the Human Services Department (1), Student Services (1), the Community College itself (1), and an outside agency (1).

Funding. Funding sources for campus child care centers include: tuition fees (4 centers); general college funds, with original equipment and start-up costs funded by a VEA grant (1 center); Student Government Association funds (2 centers); fund-raising (2 centers); U. S. Department of Agriculture Food Program (1 center); Auxiliary Service Fund (1 center); and Community Association Fund (1 center). There are three categories of college financial support for the operation of the Community College child care centers: actual funds applied to the operation of the program; in-kind contributions; and financial aid allotments to students for child care costs.

One school notes that the college contributes approximately 30 percent of operational funds, while another reported the withdrawal of college operating funds, leaving only Student Government funds and tuition fees to support their child care program.

With respect to financial aid, one college reports that $350 is allotted for their nine-month budget; another center explains that B.E.O.G. (Basic Educational Opportunity Grant) covers their tuition costs of $5.50 per day per student; and another reports that their tuition fee of $1.50 per child for each three-hour session is waived for students demonstrating financial need.

Seven of the eight respondents list in-kind contributions from the college. Six of the colleges contribute space (one specified a 50% rent reduction); five of the colleges supply heat; three provide maintenance; one, lights and phone; and one, use of pool and gym.

Six of the eight respondents estimated the annual cost per child for the operation of their child care program. Estimates from $280 - $2,273 were given, with the average cost equaling $897 per child per year. This, of course, is affected by the varying length and frequency of child care use. The annual operational budget for each program ranges from $7,000 to $49,381, with an average cost of $27,334 per year.

Staffing. Seven of the Community Colleges with child care centers responded to the questions regarding staffing of the centers. Each center has at least two salaried teachers who share a variety of responsibilities and work schedules. Five of the child care centers report that their programs are directed by a teacher with an M.S. or B.S. degree, and that this teacher is assisted by one or more salaried staff members with either a B.A. or Associate degree. The titles of personnel in these paid positions, funded through the colleges, include: Director, Assistant Director, Supervising Teacher, Program Coordinator, Clerical Aide, and Work-Study Aides.

CETA (Comprehensive Employment Training Act) and YETP (Youth Employment

Training Program) trainees assist at four of the centers. CETA and YETP staff are funded through their own programs. Unpaid staff, in most cases students, are drawn from the college's academic courses and programs. Five of the child care centers describe cooperative arrangements with academic departments at the colleges that affect staffing, two have no cooperative arrangements and one school did not respond. Four Community Colleges report that students from their Human Services curriculum and Practicum program acquire supervised work experience in the child care center. Another school noted that they arrange for observations by Nursing, Child Psychology and other interested students as well as encourage "cooperative contacts" with the departments of Drama, Music, Physical Education and Dental Hygiene for the purpose of providing enrichment or support services for the children.

Program Continuation: Incentives and Barriers. The felt need and expressed interest of target groups for child care services, and the support of faculty/staff and administration are two conditions perceived by respondents as the major incentives for establishing and continuing to operate the Community College child care centers. The need to maintain or build college enrollments, and availability of qualified staff are also perceived as incentives by respondents. Two campuses identified availability of funds and affirmative action efforts as somewhat less prominent, but still important incentives for continuing the operation of their on-site child care centers.

Only three of the responding schools with child care centers identified conditions perceived as barriers to program continuation. All three of these colleges identified insufficient funds as their primary barrier, one school also listed lack of qualified staff as a secondary barrier, and one listed absence of support from faculty/staff and administration as an additional barrier.

Despite the fact that many campuses with on-site child care centers did not identify barriers to program continuation, they did report major problems encountered in program inception and operation. The major problems associated with program inception were: building enrollments in the child care center when first opened (1); acquiring ample space (1); obtaining funds to establish the physical facilities and equipment (1); and meeting NYSDSS licensing requirements (1). For program operation, the following problems were identified: financial - "We have had problems obtaining and even maintaining enough funding to subsidize our program" (1); space - "not having a permanent facility" and "if the center were larger, we could accommodate more" (2); enrollment - "fluctuates" (1); and student need - "not being able to serve the needs of all students" (1). Two colleges cited inadequate staffing as an obstacle preventing them from operating at full capacity.

One Community College reports that their child care center was closed because of insufficient space and lack of funds. This respondent attests to the continued need for child care services at this campus, and anticipates that, with the construction of a new campus, adequate child care facilities will be provided.

BOCES Child Care Training Labs

The BOCES and Big Five City School Districts offering the "Child Care Occupations" course of study and training lab were asked to describe the purpose and operation of their child care training labs (see page 14 for summary of schools with existing labs). The title recommended by the New York State Education Department for these labs is "Child Care Laboratory Center." Other designations could be: Play School, Nursery Center, Pre-kindergarten Center, depending upon the specific arrangements made about selection, time, type of program and personnel provided for the young children.

Purpose and Population Served. Although the purpose of the "Child Care Occupations" training labs is to train secondary and adult students for jobs involving the care and guidance of young children, these labs also serve young children from the communities in which the labs are located. The participation of the young children provides realistic work experience for the student trainees.

Since the purpose of the labs is the vocational training of students, the sessions are planned primarily to accommodate the students' training needs. However, six schools reported that their labs have also served the convenience child care needs of adult students, teenage parents and staff. One respondent explained that "while not set up primarily for staff, adult and teenage parents, they are welcome to enroll their children for a nursery experience." Another respondent stated that they had attempted to develop day care for community residents, but that "too many obstacles were encountered."

All BOCES and districts with child care training labs were asked if they had ever explored the possibility of using their labs to provide convenience child care services for the children of students and staff. Eight respondents reported that they had considered this possibility; 14 indicated they had not, but would be willing to do so in the future. One of the Big Five City School Districts pointed out that, as of the 1980-81 school year, their district would be opening eight early childhood centers throughout the city to serve the children of students and staff plus other city residents. This was described as "an invaluable and much needed service."

A small number of the child care training labs are being used to serve special populations. Two BOCES conduct a pre-school program for handicapped children in their labs. One of these labs enables second year students to participate in a "clinical experience with special needs children." One BOCES reports that they have a pre-kindergarten program for economically disadvantaged pre-school children which makes use of the child care training lab facility. Another BOCES uses the lab facilities (after lab hours) to provide convenience child care services for adult women enrolled in a BOCES-based CETA training program. Still another BOCES conducts a Teenage Parents Program which includes nursery/day care services for teenage parents. One respondent expressed the opinion that if more of these special kinds of services were provided at their BOCES, "students would have more to offer local employers."

Most of the young children who participate in the child care training labs are three to five years of age, although the groups served by the labs range from infants and toddlers to age 11. Three to five year olds are accommodated by almost all of the labs, with the following percentages serving children in additional age categories as well:

under 18 months	11%
18 months - 3 years	19%
3 - 5 years	96%
school age (6 - 11)	7%

The number of children accommodated at one time ranges from 11 - 30, with the majority (65%) of the labs serving 16 - 20 children at any given time. Fifty-five percent of the respondents said their labs were filled to capacity and that they could not accommodate any more children with present staff and space limitations. Ten of the BOCES labs felt they still could serve more children although seven of these could accommodate only one to five more.

Scheduling. All of the child care labs operate for eight to nine months during the academic year, from September or October through May or June. Generally the labs are open during the school day when the student trainees are present. The sessions are typically two to three hours in length in the morning or early afternoon. One exception to this pattern is a BOCES which offers child care for a four-hour span (9:30 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.) four days a week. All labs reported that their day ends by 3:20 p.m.

Although the child care training labs serve children from one to five days a week, the majority of the labs report that children participate only three days a week. The following summary indicates the range of scheduling available for the participation of children in the child care training labs at the BOCES and Big Five City School Districts:

Number of Days Per Week That Labs Offer Participation for Children

Weekly Schedule Available	Percentage of Labs
3 days	44%
4 days	26%
2 days	15%
5 days	11%
1 day	7%

Two of the BOCES labs reserve one of their days for infants and toddlers only to familiarize their students with the special needs of this age group. The only recorded evening session at any of the labs is a two-hour evening session for infants and toddlers offered once a week by one BOCES lab.

Twenty of the 28 schools with labs report that their lab does not offer "flexible scheduling." The scheduling available for children who participate in the child care training labs in the BOCES and Big Five City School Districts is structured around the student trainees' own school day and academic year. The sessions are planned primarily to accommodate the students' training needs. Dissatisfaction with the abbreviated lab schedule was underscored by one instructor who pointed out the shortcomings of a 2 1/2 hour child care lab period: "Full-day availability would allow a trainee to gain a more realistic work experience and could be facilitated by rescheduling the student's other courses on days when the lab is not in session."

Funding. Funding for the child care labs comes primarily from local sources. Of the 26 BOCES with labs, 22 use only local funds, while one school receives additional State funding (three did not respond to this question). Both of the responding Big Five City School Districts with child care labs indicate that they are receiving additional funding from federal and VEA sources.

Seventeen BOCES report that they charge a fee for children participating in their child care training lab, while six do not impose any charge. Neither of the Big Five City School Districts charge a fee for the children served by their labs. According to the BOCES respondents, the fees are used to offset operating costs, with most of the money being used to pay for snacks and/or materials. Some schools reported their child care fee schedule based on an hourly rate, some based on a cost-per-session rate, some on a weekly or monthly schedule and some on a per semester basis. Due to the varied format used to report the fees for services provided, an average fee for children served by the labs could not be estimated.

Staffing: Professionals and Student Trainees. Sixteen of the BOCES and Big Five City School Districts with child care training labs report that two or more instructors share the responsibilities of supervising the student trainees in their child care courses and teaching and/or supervising the child care lab. In general, at least one of the supervising/teaching staff at each school has at least a B.S. or a B.A. degree.

A variety of subject areas are evident in the educational background of staff as summarized below. Several instructors have a combination of degrees and preparation in two or more fields, such as an A.S. in Nursing with a B.S. in Elementary Education, or a B.S. in Home Economics with an M.S. in Early Childhood Education.

Staff Qualifications

Degree or Certification	Non-degree	A.S.	B.S./B.A.	B.S. +	M.S./M.A.	M.S. +
Home Ec/ Homemaking		1	10	2	3	
Child care, Nursery Ed.		6	12	3	3	1
Elementary Ed.			2		2	
Nursing			2		1	
Art					1	
Vocational Tech.		1				
Aide	1					

The average number of student trainees working with the children during each lab session is nine. As many as 23 trainees participate in one lab session at one of the schools.

Transportation. Of the 28 districts surveyed, only two BOCES report that they furnish transportation to and from their lab for children participating in the program. Of the two exceptions noted, handicapped and disadvantaged children are provided with transportation at one location while in the second location, three component school districts transport nursery school children. Children participating in the child care training labs are generally transported to the centers by their parents.

Problems Encountered in the Operation of the Training Labs. Eight of the BOCES and both of the responding Big Five City School Districts with labs report that they have not encountered any major problems in the operation of the child care training labs. The remainder of respondents have identified problems relating to clientele, staffing, supervision of students, funding and facilities.

Several schools report a low enrollment of children. These schools have experienced some difficulty in finding parents willing to bring preschool children to their center. Other schools state that there are too many trainees enrolled in their child care program and not enough staff for proper supervision and individualized instruction. Several schools viewed limited funding as a major problem with one respondent observing that "administrative apathy and lack of interest prevents funding or other support from enhancing the program." Inadequate facilities were also identified as a problem area. Concerns included insufficient size of the training lab and lack of an enclosed playground area.

C. Institutional Awareness of Student Child Care Needs

All Community Colleges, BOCES and Big Five City School Districts presently without on-site child care centers to serve their adult student population were asked whether they have any data regarding student needs for child care services. Of the 64 respondents to whom this question was directed, 52 (81%) had not conducted child care needs assessments among students. Eleven (17%) of the 64 respondents indicated that they had gathered such data (one school did not respond). Percentages of respondents in each category that have child care needs assessment data are as follows:

Respondent Category	N	Percentage of respondents in each category having child care needs assessment data
Community Colleges without child care centers	19	33%
All BOCES	42	5%
Big Five City School Districts	3	33%

One Community College explained that a child care survey was "currently underway," while a second Community College reported that they had outdated information from a 1976 survey and that another needs assessment is planned for 1980. Another Community College indicated that, although hard data was not available, they were aware of the child care needs of their student population: "Through continuous discussion with students, faculty and staff, we have identified the need for a day care center. Our student population is 68 percent females, with over half of them between 21 and 32 years of age. Presently funds have been allocated from student activity fees for a day care center and the hiring of a consultant." Another Community College stated that they would be "willing to conduct such a survey if materials were supplied."

Community Colleges with child care needs assessment data were asked to identify the specific categories of students who indicated that they would use campus child care services if they were provided. Five Community Colleges identified potential users of campus child care services as the following:

- full-time students (5 respondents)
- part-time day students (4 respondents)
- full-time evening students (2 respondents)
- EOC students (1 respondent)
- faculty (4 respondents)
- staff (4 respondents)

Of the 64 respondents (Community Colleges, BOCES and Big Five City School Districts) presently without on-site child care centers to serve their adult student population, 38 (59%) report that they help their students to locate child care services in the local community. Twenty-five (39%) indicate that they do not provide this assistance.

One-half of the 64 respondents maintain an informational list of child care services that are available in the community for student use. More institutions with nursery education or child care training programs provide this kind of information than those without such programs. Several of the BOCES indicated that the "Child Care Occupations" staff members have a thorough knowledge of area child care facilities because of the practice of placing students in community child care programs for additional experience and because of contacts maintained through BOCES Advisory Committees. In addition to referrals through child care course instructors, student-parents in need of child care services are referred through counselors or are simply provided with a list of community child care facilities.

Community Colleges also provide lists of community facilities and refer student-parents through counselors as well as through the Admissions Office and the Dean's Office. Two of the colleges actually make the calls to child care facilities for their students.

Of the 64 responding schools that do not provide on-site convenience child care services for students, 25 percent report that existing child care services available in the community appear sufficient to meet student child care needs; 27 percent believe that adequate services are not available in their community; and 48 percent indicate that they have no way of knowing whether student child care needs are being met by existing community child care services. The BOCES gave the strongest indication that child care services in the community appear to be adequately meeting student needs for child care services as indicated in the following summary:

Institutional Perception of Unmet Student
Needs for Child Care Services

Question: In your opinion, do child care services in the community appear sufficient to meet student needs for such services?

Respondent Category	Yes	No	Don't Know
Community Colleges without child care centers but with Nursery Education courses	20%	40%	40%
Community Colleges without child care centers and without Nursery Education courses	21%	43%	36%
BOCES with "Child Care Occupations" training labs	23%	23%	54%
BOCES without "Child Care Occupations" training labs	38%	6%	56%

As evident from this data, a much greater proportion of Community Colleges than BOCES and of BOCES with training labs than without indicate that existing community child care services are not sufficient to meet the needs of their students for such services.

Several respondents who answered "don't know" to the above question were aware of the limitations of existing child care services in their community. One BOCES reported that a waiting list exists at the local child care center. Two respondents pointed out that existing services "usually exclude children under two years of age." One Community College respondent judged child care services in the local community as inadequate because they do not meet the needs of "middle income parents."

D. Institutional Interest in Providing On-Site Child Care Services

The 64 respondents at schools presently without on-site child care centers to serve their adult student population were asked if they felt the need for child care services among students was of sufficient scope to justify providing these services on campus. The response (frequency and percent) from each type of institution surveyed is as follows:

Perception of Student Need for On-Site
Child Care Services

Question: Do you feel the need for child care services among students is of sufficient scope to justify the provision of on-site child care services?

Respondent Category	N	Yes	No	Don't Know
Community Colleges without child care centers, but with Nursery Education Courses	4	4 100%	0%	0%
Community Colleges without child care centers and without Nursery Education Courses	14	6 43%	6 43%	2 14%
BOCES with child care training lab	24	2 8%	11 46%	11 46%
BOCES without child care training lab	16	1 16%	8 50%	7 44%
Big Five CSD's with child care training lab	2	1 50%	0%	1 50%
Big Five CSD's without child care training lab	1	0%	0%	1 100%

The data show that the Community Colleges without existing child care centers perceive the greatest student need and justification for establishing on-site child care centers. This is in contrast to the BOCES respondents, very few of whom perceive that student child care needs are substantial enough to justify providing on-site child care services.

The same respondents were asked to indicate, by ranking, those institutional factors perceived as incentives and those perceived as barriers to establishing an on-site child care center. Table 2 shows the number of respondents in each category (frequency and percent) selecting each of the institutional factors as incentives and as barriers. Presented in the last column are the total number of respondents making each selection.

Table 2

Conditions Perceived by Administrators/Staff as MAJOR INCENTIVES for Providing On-Site Child Care Services

	Community Colleges (CC-2, CC-3) N = 17	BOCES (B-1, B-2) N = 20	Big Five CSD (C-1, C-2) N = 2	TOTAL N = 39
Substantial student interest and/or need	13 76%	15 75%	1 50%	29 74%
Availability of funds	5 29%	8 40%	1 50%	14 36%
Support of faculty, staff, administrators	8 47%	4 20%	1 50%	13 33%
Availability of qualified staff	3 18%	3 15%	1 50%	7 18%
Need to increase and/or stabilize enrollments	11 65%	4 20%	0 0%	15 38%
Affirmative action	1 5%	3 15%	0 0%	4 10%
Other	1 5%	1 5%	0 0%	2 5%

Conditions Perceived by Administrators/Staff as MAJOR BARRIERS to Providing On-Site Child Care Services

	Community Colleges (CC-2, CC-3) N = 17	BOCES (B-1, B-2) N = 20	Big Five CSD (C-1, C-2) N = 2	TOTAL N = 39
Insufficient student interest and/or need	4 24%	10 50%	0 0%	14 36%
Insufficient funds	14 82%	10 50%	2 100%	26 67%
Absence of support from administration and/or staff	3 18%	1 5%	0 0%	4 10%
Lack of qualified staff	4 24%	0 0%	0 0%	4 10%
No available space	12 71%	8 40%	0 0%	20 51%
Other	1 5%	3 15%	0 0%	4 10%

The major incentive for providing on-site child care services perceived at both the Community Colleges and the BOCES is "substantial student interest and/or need." The second most frequently indicated incentive at Community Colleges is the "need to increase and/or stabilize enrollment," while at the BOCES "availability of funds" is second, while "support of faculty/staff/administrators" and the "need to increase and/or stabilize enrollments" compete for third place at the BOCES. The Big Five City School Districts ranked the first four choices equally as conditions encouraging the provision of on-site child care. The combined total of all respondents (39) from the three types of institutions reveals "substantial student interest and/or need" as the leading incentive (74%) with "need to increase and/or stabilize enrollments" (38%) and "availability of funds" (36%) holding relatively distant second and third places.

The major barrier indicated by 14 of the 17 (82%) Community Colleges is "insufficient funds." Ten of the 20 BOCES respondents (50%) chose "insufficient funds" and "insufficient student interest and/or need" equally as the number one barrier to providing on-site child care services. "No available space" was also cited by 40 percent of the BOCES respondents. Both of the Big Five City School District respondents selected "insufficient funds" as the sole barrier to providing on-site child care services.

The combined total of responses from the three types of institutions surveyed reveals "insufficient funds" as the primary barrier, cited by 26 of 39 respondents (67%). "No available space" was the second ranked barrier, perceived by 20 of 39 respondents (51%); and "insufficient student interest and/or need" was the third ranked barrier chosen by 14 of 39 respondents (36%).

E. Summary of Phase One Findings

The Phase One child care survey of New York State Community Colleges, BOCES and Big Five City School Districts has gathered information with respect to: perceptions of administrators/faculty/staff regarding student needs for child care services; agency awareness of the availability of child care services; present status of child care services, programs, facilities at all agencies surveyed; agency interest in providing on-site child care services where they do not already exist; the extent to which existing on-site child care services are serving occupational education students; and the likelihood that current and prospective students would use on-site child care services if these were to be made available where they are not presently provided. The Phase One survey has produced the following findings:

1. Student needs for child care services, as perceived by administrators, faculty, and other contact persons, are greater at the Community Colleges that are not presently providing on-site child care services and at the Big Five City School Districts than they are at the BOCES.

2. At schools where child care training, nursery education or early childhood programs and courses exist, there appears to be increased awareness on the part of the respondent of child care services available in the local community and of the adequacy of these services to meet student needs.

3. Slightly under one-half of all SUNY and CUNY Community Colleges combined are presently operating on-site child care centers designed to meet the convenience child care needs of students, faculty and staff. Most of these centers have cooperative arrangements with academic departments whereby practical work experience and supervision is provided for students.

4. Slightly over one-half of all New York State BOCES are presently operating child care training lab facilities for the purpose of training secondary and adult students as child care occupational workers. These labs, which are generally fully equipped child care centers, provide for the participation of young children from the BOCES and surrounding communities. However, they are designed to meet the specific training needs of BOCES "child care occupations" students and not the convenience child care needs of BOCES adult or secondary students who are parents.

5. A few of the BOCES child care training labs are being used to serve special populations, such as handicapped and economically disadvantaged children. Two of the labs are being used to serve the child care needs of special parent populations, such as teenage parents and adult women enrolled in a BOCES-operated CETA program.

6. Eight BOCES and school districts with child care training labs have explored the possibility of using their labs to provide convenience child care services for students; 14 BOCES and school districts indicated that they would be willing to consider this possibility in the future.

7. One of the Big Five City School Districts will be opening eight early childhood centers in 1980-81 to serve the children of students and staff in response to perceived need.

8. Current users of on-site child care centers at the Community Colleges include male and female occupational education students and some single heads of households.

9. On-site child care centers at the Community Colleges are not able to meet the child care needs of all students for the following reasons:

   - centers are not open during the evening hours when some students attend classes,

   - most centers do not accept children under 18 months or school-aged children,

   - some students need full-day service availability which all centers do not provide,

   - some students prefer child care arrangements closer to home because of long distances traveled from home to school.

10. Many of the Community Colleges providing on-site child care services hesitate to expand their services to include evening care because of limited need perceived at the schools for such services.

11. Many of the Community Colleges providing on-site child care services hesitate to include children under 18 months and school-aged children because of limited space, stringent licensing requirements and the prohibitive cost of serving these age groups.

12. The factor most frequently identified by Community Colleges and BOCES as an incentive for establishing an on-site child care center is substantial interest and need on the part of students. The factor most frequently identified by these respondents as a barrier to establishing an on-site child care center is insufficient funds. It can be concluded from the data presented in Table 2 that if substantial student need is perceived, there will be greater support among faculty/staff/administration for on-site child care services which, it is assumed, will help to maintain and increase adult student enrollments. With institutional support and approval, funds and facilities for the establishment and continued operation of a child care center are more likely to be made available.

III. PHASE TWO STUDENT SURVEY - PROCESS

Population and Sample

The target population for this study of student child care needs was defined as all female students with children under the age of 12, who are currently enrolled or who are considering enrollment in:

1. full-time or part-time occupational education programs at the 30 Community Colleges of the State University of New York; and
2. adult preparatory, apprenticeship and supplemental programs at the 44 New York State Boards of Cooperative Educational Services.

The sample was drawn from seven selected sites, four BOCES and three Community Colleges, located in three regional clusters. From these seven sites, a representative sample of the population, consisting of 222 current students and 50 prospective students, was selected. A current student is any woman, with a child under the age of 12, who is presently enrolled in one of the occupational programs listed above. A prospective student is defined as any woman, with a child under the age of 12, living in the college or BOCES service area, who has been identified by a current student as having an interest in enrolling in occupational education programs or courses or who has made initial contact with the school for this purpose. These are women who are likely to become students in the future, but who have chosen to postpone enrollment.

Statewide there are 37,629 women enrolled in occupational programs in the 30 SUNY Community Colleges and 38,645 women enrolled in the three types of adult occupational programs in the 44 New York State BOCES. Numbers indicating the proportion of these women who have children under the age of 12 are not available, either at the State level or from the institutions themselves. The initial screening survey described in the first section of this report was used to help in defining the target population at the selected sites. This survey identified students with children in the target age group by name and address and assisted in the identification by referral of prospective students. The sample of current students was drawn from screening survey results. Prospective students were identified through screening survey referrals and through registration lists for introductory courses (as described in the first section of this report).

Site Selection

Three Community Colleges and three BOCES (a fourth was added later) were selected so that the six sites would be located in three regional clusters with a BOCES and a college in each cluster. Each of the three clusters was judged representative of a suburban, urban or rural region of New York State, based upon information obtained from the Bureau of the Census through the New York State Department of Commerce.

To identify the six sites, a two-phase process was used:

1. determination of all sites eligible for selection. Eligibility was based upon: a minimum population of 100 female occupational students in the target programs and proximity (15 miles or less) of a BOCES and a Community College; and
2. final selection of sites according to availability of child care services and population density/rural-urban mix in the county in which the institution is located. Data to determine child care services availability by county was obtained from the New York State Department of Social Services which maintains

a list indicating, for each county, the number of day care "slots" (or places available) for all licensed day care centers and family provider homes.

The child care literature points to the concentration or dispersement of population and to the distances that exist between residences and places of employment or child care facilities as conditions influencing the use of child care services. It was, therefore, considered important to select sites representatively along a rural/urban continuum. Availability of child care services was also considered an important criterion in the selection of sites because awareness of available services is one of the variables of the study and because availability, which has been shown to vary considerably according to county and region in the State, has been reported by the literature to possibly affect use of services and awareness of what exists.

Three regional clusters were selected to be representatively urban, suburban and rural and representatively high, medium and low with respect to the availability of child care services, based upon data obtained from the census and from the Department of Social Services. Table 3 (page 42) presents data showing site selection criteria and percentage of students participating for each site and from each region.

Analysis of Data

The student questionnaire was designed so that several of the major variables--use, preferences and attitudes--could be measured on a scale ranging from extra-family child care to intra-family child care. Each of the child care arrangements that respondents were asked to select (in the case of use and preferences) and each of the attitudinal statements with which they were asked to indicate the extent of their agreement were weighted so that the scoring would reflect the extra/intra-family construct.

Table 3

Sample Distribution by Region and Site

Regional Cluster	Type	Child Care Services Availability	Current Students N = 222 % of Currents	Prospective Students N = 50 % of Prospectives	Combined N = 272 % of Total Sample
1 - Middletown-Goshen	Suburban	Low-medium	34.2	20.0	31.6
2 - Utica-Rome	Urban	High	38.7	80.0	46.3
3 - Batavia*	Rural	Medium	27.1	0	22.1

Region		Current Students N = 222	Prospective Students N = 50	Combined Current/ Prospective N = 272
		%	%	%
1	Orange Co. Comm. College	14.9	10.0	14.0
	Orange-Ulster BOCES	19.4	10.0	17.6
	MVCC Rome	24.3 } 29.7	0	19.9 } 38.6
2	MVCC Utica	5.4	78.0	18.8
	Oneida BOCES	3.2	2.0	2.9
	Herkimer BOCES	5.9	0	4.8
3	Genesee Community College	19.8	0	16.2
	Genesee-Wyoming BOCES	7.2	0	5.9

*Since it was not possible to obtain a sample of prospective students from the Batavia Region, this region has a smaller overall sample size.

For purposes of this study, extra-family child care refers to formal, organized, institutional types of child care, generally in a group setting outside of the child's own home, by a caretaker who is not related to the child. Intra-family child care refers to informal care in the child's own home or in the caretaker's home by a member of the child's own family, a relative or friend of the family.

A mean score was obtained for each respondent on each of the major variables: attitudes toward the care and raising of children;

preferences for particular types of child care arrangements; *awareness* of available child care services; *use* of services; and *satisfaction* with services used. In each case, the scores for the individual items comprising each of the major variables were summed and then divided by the number of items to obtain the respondent's mean score. A mean score was obtained for current students and for prospective students. The scoring was designed so that there would be a range of scores for each of the major variables. For the variables attitudes, preferences and use, the high end of the range reflects extra-family child care favorability, and the low end indicates intra-family child care favorability. A high attitudes score reflects attitudes that are favorable to the extra-family care of children; a high preference score reflects preferences for child care arrangements that are extra-family, formalized and institutional in nature; and a high use score indicates that the respondent is using extra-family child care arrangements to a greater extent than she is using intra-family arrangements.

An awareness score at the high end of the range simply indicates that the respondent is relatively aware of the child care arrangements that are available to her while she attends classes. An awareness score at the low end of the range indicates that the respondent is relatively unaware of the child care arrangements that are available to her while she attends classes. Satisfaction scores reflect the degree of satisfaction with the child care arrangements presently used. The low end of the satisfaction score range indicates low satisfaction; the high end of the range indicates high satisfaction.

Definition of Terms

Child Care. A more comprehensive term than "day care." Child care generally refers to a variety of formal and informal arrangements for the care of the child from birth through age 14 by someone other than the child's own parents during brief or extended periods of the day or night. For purposes of this study, the definition will be restricted to care of the child from birth through age 11, but will be expanded to include care by one of the parents when the other is away from home. The distinction between "child care" and "day care" is general versus specific.

Day Care. Refers solely to more formal organized arrangements for the care of children. It can include all children birth through age 14, day and evening hours, but generally refers to the daytime care of pre-school children and toddlers in a center or family home, licensed or unlicensed. The developmental/educational component may or may not be included. For purposes of this study, day care will include all children birth through age 11.

Extra-Family Child Care. This refers to formal, organized institutional types of child care, generally in a group setting, outside of the child's own home, by a caretaker who is not related to the child.

Intra-Family Child Care. This refers to informal care by a member of the child's own family, a relative or friend of the family in the child's own home or in the caretaker's home. For purposes of this study, this will also include arrangements such as the child being in school or caring for self since these are considered minimally disruptive to the normal operations of the family.

IV. PHASE TWO STUDENT SURVEY - FINDINGS

A. Demographic Profile of Student Population

At present, very little information is available that describes adult and postsecondary occupational students who have children of their own. In order to build a demographic profile of the target population at the seven sites selected for this in-depth survey of student child care needs, a variety of questions were asked.

Current versus Prospective Students

Age, Marital Status and Income. The majority of students, 60 percent of the sample of current and prospective students combined, are between 25 and 34 years of age. Students in the 35 to 44 age bracket comprise the second largest group, 22 percent of the sample. Marital status data reveal that 77 percent of all students surveyed are married, 18 percent are widowed/separated/divorced, and 5 percent identify themselves as single. Age and marital status data for current students, prospective students and both groups combined are summarized as follows:

Age of Population Surveyed

	Current Students N = 222	Prospective Students N = 50	Combined N = 272
	%	%	%
Under 25 years	17.6	10.0	16.2
25 - 34 years	59.0	62.0	59.6
35 - 44 years	21.2	26.0	22.1
45 - 54 years	2.3	2.0	2.2

Martial Status of Population Surveyed

Single	5.4	4.0	5.1
Married	75.2	82.0	76.5
Widowed/divorced/ separated	19.4	14.0	18.4

The total annual family income for all participants in the study was fairly equally distributed, with 50.4 percent of the total sample earning $5,000 - $15,000 per year and 49 percent earning $15,000 - $20,000 or more. The following summary indicates the percentages of current, prospective and all students who responded to this item in each of the income brackets.

Total Family Income for Last Year

	Current Students N = 209	Prospective Students N = 47	Combined N = 256
	%	%	%
Under $5,000	11.0	2.1	.4
$5,000 - $10,000	20.6	12.8	19.1
$10,000 - $15,000	20.6	27.7	21.9
$15,000 - $20,000	22.0	17.0	21.1
Over $20,000	25.4	20.4	28.1

Eligibility for Child Care Allowance. A relatively small number of all of the students sampled are currently eligible for, or are participating in, a program that provides a child care allowance:

Current students	6.1%
Prospective students	8.2%
Combined groups	6.5%

Respondents who indicated they are currently receiving a child care allowance were asked to identify the funding source. Three prospective students named their county-administered Social Services Program (AFDC) and one woman with a handicapped teenage daughter cited the federally-funded "Homemaker Program" sponsored by the Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities. Six current students cited CETA, two named BEOG (Basic Educational Opportunity Grant) and TAP (Tuition Assistance Program) and two listed AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children).

Children Living at Home. Respondents were asked to identify the number and ages of their children who are living at home. The following summary shows percentages of students with children in the various age groups.

Percentage of Students with Children in Each Age Grouping

	Current Students N = 222	Prospective Students N = 50	Combined N = 272
	%	%	%
Under 2½ years	24	30	25
2½ - 5 years	53	50	53
6 - 11 years	60	62	60
12 and over	21	36	24

This summary indicates that 60 percent of respondents have school-aged children 6 - 11 years of age, 53 percent have children 2 1/2 - 5 years of age and 25 percent have children under 2 1/2 years of age. Twenty-four percent also have a child (or children) over age 12 living at home. The data show that the heaviest concentration of children, for both current and prospective students, is in the 6 - 11 age group, with the 2 1/2 - 5 age group representing the second heaviest concentration. The 272 combined respondents listed a total of 574 children. This represents a mean of 2.1 children per respondent. Means for the current student group and prospective student group are almost identical: 2.1 children for current students and 2.2 children for prospective students.

Educational Background. High school graduation is the highest level of education for the majority (49%) of current and prospective students sampled. An additional 18.5 percent have completed one year of college, 9.6 percent have completed two years of college and 5.6 percent are four-year college graduates. An additional 15 percent of respondents indicated a variety of other educational experiences, including some master's level courses, a master's degree (6 students), LPN and three-year nursing programs, BOCES occupational education training and technical training courses. The following is a summary of respondents' educational status.

Educational Status: Highest Level of Education

	Current Students N = 222	Prospective Students N = 50	Combined N = 272
	%	%	%
10th grade	2.3	0	1.8
High school graduate	51.4	38.0	48.9
1 year college	18.5	18.0	18.4
2 years college	8.6	14.0	9.6
4 year college graduate	4.5	10.0	5.5
Other	14.4	18.0	15.1

Prospective students were asked to indicate their plans, however tentative, for returning to school in the future for occupational education and training. Ninety percent (45 out of 50) responded that they are definitely considering attending classes in the future, while 8 percent (4 out of 50) responded negatively or were unsure of their plans. Of those who are considering returning to school in the future, 53 percent named a local community college as their choice, 2 percent cited some other commutable community college, 16 percent named a local SUNY four-year college, 7 percent named a local independent four-year college, and 2 percent cited an out-of-area college.

For the majority of prospective women students (52%), the preferred time for attending classes was evenings. Twenty-six percent of the prospective students preferred daytime classes, and 6 percent stated that they would attend classes either days or evenings or both. The primary reason given by those who prefer evening classes is that they work during the day and must accommodate school attendance to their work schedule.

Other reasons given for the evening preference is that a spouse or an older child would be home to babysit, and they perceive that there might be other older returning adults like themselves in the evenings. The primary reason given by the prospective students who prefer day classes is that their children would be in school at that time. In addition, several who prefer a day schedule stated that they would prefer to be home with the family in the evenings.

Work Schedule/Class Attendance/Commuting Time. Questions surveying current and prospective students' work schedules and current students' class schedules were included to obtain a composite profile of the amount of time respondents are spending away from their home and children. The following summaries indicate work schedules, class schedules and travel time for the target population.

Of all students surveyed, 50 percent are currently employed and 50 percent are unemployed. The percentage of prospective women students who are currently employed is higher than that for current students (and for the national statistical average).

Employment

	Current Students N = 214	Prospective Students N = 50	Combined N = 264
	%	%	%
Currently employed	45.3	70.0	50.0
Unemployed	54.7	30.0	50.0

For current and prospective students combined, 41 percent of those employed work 31 - 40 hours per week. Current and prospective students are fairly comparable in terms of number of hours worked per week.

Number of Hours Per Week Students Are Employed

	Current Students N = 90	Prospective Students N = 35	Combined N = 125
	%	%	%
10 or less	12	9	11
11 - 20	28	26	27
21 - 30	13	11	13
31 - 40	40	43	41
41 - 50	3	3	2
Over 50	3	9	6

Respondents who are employed were also asked to identify their daily or weekly work schedules. The largest segment (40%) of current and prospective students combined work whole days, while 31.5 percent indicate a varying schedule. The third largest group of respondents, 8.5 percent, work mornings only or evenings only. Current and prospective students have roughly equivalent work schedules as summarized below.

Students' Work Schedule

	Current Students N = 95	Prospective Students N = 35	Combined N = 130
	%	%	%
Whole days	38	46	40
Mornings only	7	11	9
Afternoons only	4	3	4
Evenings only	10	6	9
Nights only	5	3	5
Weekends	4	0	3
Varying schedule	32	31	32

Current students were also asked to describe their class schedule. Forty-five percent of the currently enrolled women are evening students, 40 percent are day students, and 15 percent attend classes both days and evenings. The number of days per week that currently enrolled students attend classes varies from one to five days as summarized below:

1 day - 28.8%
2 days - 17.9%
3 days - 13.7%
4 days - 9.4%
5 days - 30.2%

The following summary shows the number of weekly class hours and number of courses for current students in the sample.

Class hours/week	% of Current Students	Course Load	% of Current Students
1-4 hours	32.8%	1 course	49.7%
5-8 hours	18.4%	2 courses	18.2%
9-16 hours	15.0%	3 courses	13.9%
17-24 hours	18.0%	4 courses	10.2%
25-32 hours	9.0%	5 courses	6.4%
33-40 hours	6.0%	6 courses	1.1%
41-45 hours	.4%	7 courses	.5%

NOTE: Class hours refer to time spent in the classroom and not to course credits; therefore, a student may be taking one course that meets twice a week for a total of 6-8 hours. Class hours per week and course load consequently are not directly comparable.

Thirty-three percent of current students indicate that they are attending classes for 1 - 4 hours per week although nearly 50 percent of currently enrolled students are taking only one course.

Current students were also asked to indicate the length of time it takes them to drive from home to class. The majority of respondents, 52.7 percent, can drive to class in less than 20 minutes. Percentages for student drive time are as follows.

Length of Time It Takes CURRENT STUDENTS to Drive from Home to Class

	N = 220	
Under 10 minutes	20.5%	52.8%
10 - 19 minutes	32.3%	
20 - 29 minutes	23.6%	
30 - 60 minutes	23.2%	
Over 60 minutes	.5%	

Related Background Information. To complete the profile of current and prospective students in the target population, respondents were asked if there are other persons living in the household who are available to provide child care when needed. Forty-two percent of all students surveyed replied that someone is available in their household to provide child care when needed, while 58 percent do not have anyone available. The majority, or 79 percent, of those students who have someone available in the household cited "spouse," with "older child" as the next most frequently available caretaker (17.5%). Other persons cited by the students include parent (10.5%), other relative (7%) and friend (6%).

In addition to identifying the number of students with someone available in the household to provide child care when needed, current students were asked if they are presently using the child care center (if available) at the school they attend. Forty-eight of the total current student sample, or 21.6 percent, identified themselves as "on-site users" -- mothers who are currently using child care facilities provided at their school or campus.

Regional Demographic Profile of Current Students

The demographic data for current students only were analyzed by region. (Prospective student data were not included because prospectives were represented in only two of the three regions.)

Age, Marital Status and Income. There were no significant regional differences in the ages of the current and prospective students, and the marital status of current students in each region was comparable to the total sample. There was a significant contrast, however, between the marital status of prospective students in Region 1 and that of prospective students in Region 2. In Region 1, all of the prospective students listed themselves as married, while in Region 2, 22.5 percent of the prospective students identified themselves as single, widowed, divorced or separated. This difference may be attributed to the way in which prospective students were identified in the two regions. In Region 1, they were referred by current students through the initial screening survey. In Region 2, they were identified through official registration lists for introductory courses designed specifically for reentry women, which included more women who were single, widowed, divorced or separated.

Some regional differences in income level are evident. In Region 1, fewer of the current student respondents are in the middle income brackets ($10,000-15,000) as compared to the total sample, and a higher percentage, 34.2 percent, are in the highest income bracket (over $20,000). In Region 3, a smaller percentage of the current students are in the under $5,000 income bracket (6.9%), while a greater proportion (29.3%) are in the $15,000-20,000 income bracket, compared to the statewide sample. Overall, a greater proportion of the current student sample from Regions 1 and 3 are in the higher income bracket than are students from Region 2, which is the most urban of the three regions. These trends are indicated in the following summary.

CURRENT STUDENTS' Total Family Income for Last Year

	Total Sample N = 209	Region 1 N = 71	Region 2 N = 80	Region 3 N = 58
	%	%	%	%
Under $5,000	11.0	14.1	11.2	6.9
$5,000-10,000	20.6	21.1	20.0	19.0
$10,000-15,000	20.6	7.9	30.0	22.4
$15,000-20,000	22.0	17.1	20.0	29.3
Over $20,000	25.4	34.2	18.7	22.4

Children Living at Home. All respondents were asked to report the ages of their children. A comparison of the three regions reveals no outstanding regional differences. In each region, as in the total sample, those with children between the ages of 2 1/2 and 11 comprise the largest group of respondents, with considerably fewer reporting that they are parents of children under 2 1/2 or over 12. Percentages of current students with children in each age category for each region and for the total sample are as follows.

Percentage of CURRENT STUDENTS with Children in Each Age Category

	Total Sample N = 222	Region 1 N = 76	Region 2 N = 86	Region 3 N = 60
	%	%	%	%
Under 2½ years	24.0	19.7	23.2	30.0
2½ - 5 years	53.0	55.2	50.0	55.0
6 - 11 years	60.0	64.4	58.1	56.6
12 and over	21.0	19.7	20.9	23.3

Educational Background. A regional comparison of the highest level of education attained by current students reveals that a greater proportion of respondents in Regions 1 and 3 have completed one to four years of college than have Region 2 respondents. In Region 2, the greatest concentration of respondents has not completed any schooling beyond high school. Educational status data for the total sample of current students and for each of the three regional clusters is as follows.

Educational Status of CURRENT STUDENTS: Highest Level of Education

	Total Sample N = 222	Region 1 N = 76	Region 2 N = 85	Region 3 N = 60
	%	%	%	%
10th grade	2.3	1.3	2.4	3.3
High school graduate	51.4	52.6	56.5	43.3
1 year college	18.5	21.1	15.3	20.0
2 years college	8.6	7.9	7.1	11.7
4 year college graduate	4.5	6.6	1.2	6.7
Other	14.4	10.5	17.6	15.0

Commuting Time. There appear to be some regional differences in the length of time it takes for current students to drive from home to class as shown below.

Length of Time It Takes CURRENT STUDENTS to Drive from Home to Class

	Total Sample N = 220	Region 1 N = 76	Region 2 N = 84	Region 3 N = 60
	%	%	%	%
Under 10 minutes	20.5	7.9	22.6	33.3
10 - 19 minutes	32.3	27.6	36.9	31.7
20 - 29 minutes	23.6	32.9	20.2	16.7
30 - 60 minutes	23.2	30.3	20.2	18.3
Over 60 minutes	.5	1.3	0	0

Region 2 responses are fairly evenly distributed, as is the statewide sample. It takes Region 2 students anywhere from under 10 minutes to an hour to drive from home to school. In Region 1, however, the majority of students (64.5%) report that they must drive 20 minutes to over an hour to get from home to class. In contrast to Region 1, the majority of Region 3 respondents (65%) indicate a shorter drive from home to school (from under 10 minutes to 19 minutes at the most).

Summary: Demographic Profile of Current and Prospective Students

The demographic characteristics of current versus prospective students are fairly similar with respect to age, marital status, average number of children and ages of children living at home. The majority of women in both the current and prospective student samples are between the ages of 25 and 34, married and have an average of 2.1 - 2.2 children who are between the ages of 2 1/2 and 11. Although current and prospective student groups are fairly similar, some contrasts exist between the two groups in the areas of income, education and employment. The chi-square statistic was used to compare current and prospective students for selected demographic variables. Table 4 (page 57) presents this comparison and identifies employment as the only variable for which there is a significant difference between the two groups.

Seventy percent of the sample of prospective students are employed, while only 45.3 percent of the current students are employed. This difference was found to be significant at the .01 level ($X^2 = 8.91$, $p < .01$). An additional analysis comparing the number of hours worked per week by the employed members of each group (current and prospective) showed no significant difference.

Of those that are employed in both groups, most work full-time and whole days. This would indicate that work responsibilities due to economic necessity are possible barriers for adults who might wish to return to school. The majority of prospectives identified evening classes

Table 4

COMPARISON OF SELECTED DEMOGRAPHICS:
CURRENT AND PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS

Variables	Current N = 222	Prospective N = 50	
Age:			
Under 25	17.6%	10.0%	
25 - 34	59.0%	62.0%	
35 - 44	21.2%	26.0%	
45 - 54	2.3%	2.0%	
Employment:			
Yes	45.3%	70.0%	**
No	54.7%	30.0%	
Marital Status:			
Single	5.4%	4.0%	
Married	75.2%	82.0%	
Widowed/Separated/Divorced	19.4%	14.0%	
Highest Level of Education:			
10th grade	2.3%	0	
High School	51.6%	38.8%	
1 year college	18.6%	18.4%	
2 years college	8.6%	14.3%	
4 years college	4.5%	10.2%	
Other	14.5%	18.4%	
Income:			
Under $5,000	11.1%	2.1%	
$5,000 - $10,000	20.7%	12.8%	
$10,000 - $15,000	20.7%	27.7%	
$15,000 - $20,000	22.1%	17.0%	
Over $20,000	25.4%	40.4%	

*Chi square value significant at .05
**Chi square value significant at .01

as their preference when they do return to school. The reasons given for the evening attendance preference were: daytime job responsibilities; evening availability of spouse or older child to babysit; and the perception that there might be more returning adults like themselves in the evening classes. For the 26 percent of prospective students who prefer to attend classes during the day, the primary reason given is that their children will be in school during that time and no special child care arrangements will be necessary. An additional reason offered is the desire to be home with their families in the evenings.

A comparison of income levels for current and prospective students reveals that a slightly higher percentage of prospective students than current students are in the higher income brackets. This difference might be accounted for by the greater proportion of prospective students who work full-time.

A higher percentage of prospective students than current students have attended at least one to four years of college. Nearly 54 percent of the current student sample had completed only high school or less, as compared to 38 percent of the prospective student sample.

The majority of current students (52.7%) can drive from home to class in less than 20 minutes, 46.8 percent have to commute 20 minutes to an hour, while only .5% of the current student sample must drive over an hour to get from home to class.

Although only a few of the sites selected for this study provide on-site child care services, 48 respondents, or 21.6 percent, of the current student sample identified themselves as users of on-site child care services.

The few regional demographic differences that exist among students are in educational level, marital status, income level and drive time from home to school. Current students in (urban) Region 2 have a somewhat different educational and income profile from current students in (suburban) Region 1 and (rural) Region 3. Fewer Region 2 current students have completed any education beyond high school graduation, and fewer are in the higher income brackets. A greater proportion of the prospective students from Region 2 are single heads of household, compared with prospective students from Region 1. Many Region 1 students must travel longer to get from home to class than students in Regions 2 and 3.

B. Analysis of Major Variables

Barriers to Program Access

In order to determine the extent to which child care needs present a barrier to program access, current and prospective students were asked to identify any or all conditions that may make it hard for them to attend classes. A summary of current and prospective students' responses is as follows.

Conditions that Make It Hard for Student to Attend Classes

	CURRENT STUDENTS N = 222	PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS N = 50
	%	%
Transportation	17	18
Child care needs	60	54
Work hours	23	20
Money	45	46
Family responsibilities	42	16
Other	5	10
None	11	14

Note: Percentages total over 100% since students were asked to check as many barriers as apply.

The majority of both current and prospective students in the total sample (60% current, 54% prospective) identified "child care needs" as a condition that makes it hard for them to attend classes. One prospective student noted, "Because of problems with child care, I dropped out of the Community College. I wanted to study art badly enough so I found a way around the barriers [by enrolling in a correspondence course]." Another student commented, "I live one hour from Community College (B), but despite the long ride, I liked the campus child care center there. Community College (A) is closer but did not have child care available. I drove to Community College (B) because of their child care program." A third prospective student noted, "In my particular situation, my son is in kindergarten until 11:30. I have a sitter until 12:30. I would have desired additional day courses at the Community College, but it was impossible because of child care problems."

The second most frequently identified barrier to program access was money. Forty-five percent of current students and 46 percent of prospective students pointed to insufficient "money" as a condition that makes it hard for them to attend classes. Forty-two percent of current students listed "family responsibilities" as a barrier to program access, compared to 16 percent of prospectives. "Work hours" was identified by 20 percent of prospective students and 23 percent of current students as a condition that interferes with class attendance.

Other conditions listed by respondents as limiting actual or potential class attendance were: (for prospectives) inconvenient class scheduling, distance of the school from the student's home; (for currents) husband's class attendance, illness of child or other family member, winter weather and public school vacations.

A comparable proportion of students from both groups (current - 11%, prospective - 14%) indicated that they did not perceive any barriers at all to class attendance.

A comparison of student responses on a regional basis is as follows.

Regional Comparison

Conditions That Make It Hard for Student to Attend Classes

	Region 1 (Suburban) Current N = 76	Region 2 (Urban) Current N = 86	Region 3 (Rural) Current N = 60
	%	%	%
Transportation	19.7	16.2	13.3
Child care needs	69.7	65.1	40.0
Work hours	14.4	13.9	11.6
Money	57.8	38.3	38.3
Family responsibility	50.0	31.3	46.6
Other	2.6	5.8	5.0
None	3.9	9.3	23.3

Note: Percentages total over 100% since students were asked to check as many barriers as apply.

An analysis of the data shows that child care is viewed fairly equally as a barrier by students in Region 1 (69.7%) and Region 2 (65.1%). In Region 3 where campus child care is available to a larger proportion of the sample, only 40 percent of current students identified "child care needs" as a condition limiting class attendance.

Students who identified "child care needs" as a condition that affects class attendance were also asked to indicate the primary reason why child care was singled out as a barrier or potential barrier. The responses of current and prospective students are summarized as follows.

Primary Reason Child Care Needs Make It Hard for Student to Attend Class

	Current N = 153	Prospective N = 34
	%	%
Child care not available at times needed	48	56
Not available for children the age of my children	9	6
Costs too much	24	15
Transportation	5	-
Other	14	24

Of those who responded to this item, the majority of current and prospective students cited as the primary reason "child care not available at times needed." Twenty-four percent of current students and 15 percent of prospectives identified the "cost of child care" as the primary reason. One current student commented, "I think the child care center on campus is great. My only disappointment is that they won't take children under three years of age. The amount it costs to take my youngest to a professional nursery school is my reason for having to stop taking classes during the daytime."

All prospective students and current students on those campuses where on-site child care services do not exist were asked if they would use campus child care if it were available at a cost of $1.00 per hour. The responses of current and prospective students for the total sample are as follows.

Question: If child care services were available to you on campus at a cost of $1.00/hour, would you use them?

	Current Students (222) N = 177	Prospective Students (50) N = 45
	%	%
Yes	46	64
No	31	33
Don't know	23	2

The data show that a higher percentage of prospective students (64%) than current students (46%) indicate that they would be willing to use campus child care services at the cost of $1.00 per hour and that fewer prospectives (2%) than currents (23%) are unsure of what their actions might be in the future. The responses of current and prospective students on this item were compared using the chi-square statistic. The difference between the two groups was found to be significant at the .01 level ($X^2 = 10.48$, $p < .01$). This difference may be attributed to the fact that current students are already, of necessity, making some kind of arrangement for the care of their children while they attend classes. Their willingness to use campus child care, if available, is likely to be influenced by various aspects of their present experience. One current student commented that "$1.00 an hour is too much to charge for on-campus child care considering most babysitters charge $1 an hour and you have the convenience of your child being home, put to bed early, etc." She added, "to make it attractive to me, the rate for on-campus child care would have to be lower."

Those current students who had indicated their willingness to use campus child care services, if available, at the cost of $1.00 an hour were asked how this might affect their educational plans. Fifteen percent of the students responding to this item indicated that child care availability would not affect their school attendance at all. Thirty-two percent indicated that it might change their plans sometime in the future. The remainder of the respondents identified specific ways in which campus child care availability might affect their class attendance at present:

23% - might attend days instead of evenings
14% - might attend additional evening courses
13% - might enroll in additional daytime courses
2% - other

Eighteen percent of the current student sample indicated that the availability of campus child care could also make a difference to other adult members of their household who might be considering enrolling in classes.

Use of Child Care Arrangements

Current and prospective students were asked to indicate which child care arrangement or arrangements they were presently using for their children in each of the age categories--under 2 1/2, 2 1/2 - 5, and 6 - 11. Current students were to identify child care services used while they attend classes; prospective students were to indicate services used while they were away from home for any reason. Table 5 shows the percentage of respondents, current and prospective, with children in each of the age categories, who have indicated that they are using each of the child care arrangements.

Table 5

USE

Child Care Arrangements Used by Students Who Have Children in Specific Age Categories

	CURRENT STUDENTS (222)					PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS (50)				
Arrangements	Under 2½ N=53	2½-5 N=118	6-11 N=133	X age groups N=304	RANK*	Under 2½ N=15	2½-5 N=25	6-11 N=31	X age groups N=71	RANK*
	%	%	%	%		%	%	%	%	
1) Care by family member, other relative or close friend	83.0	70.3	82.3	72.4	1	86.7	76.0	83.9	81.7	1
2) Care by babysitter	45.3	46.6	40.6	43.8	2	53.3	48.0	61.3	54.9	2
3) Care by licensed family day-care home	3.8	2.5	0	1.6	8	6.7	0	3.2	2.8	7
4) Care by child care center or after-school center in community	3.8	12.7	1.5	6.3	6	13.3	24.0	12.9	16.9	4
5) Care by campus child care center (Current Students only)	22.6	27.1	3.0	15.8	4	-	-	-	-	-
6) Child in school during hours you are away	0	10.2	42.1	22.4	3	0	16.0	58.1	31.0	3
7) Child takes care of self	0	.8	15.0	6.9	5	0	0	32.3	14.1	5
8) Other	3.8	2.5	2.3	2.6	7	0	4.0	6.5	4.2	6

NOTE: N=number of students with one or more children in respective age groups who indicated they were using one or more of child care arrangements listed.
Percentages for each column will total over 100 percent because of multiple responses.
*Rank order of most frequently used arrangements across-age groupings.

As shown in the table, "care by family member, other relative or close friend" is the arrangement most frequently used by current and prospective students for children in all three of the age categories. Among current students, 72.4 percent use this arrangement in contrast to 81.7 percent of prospective students. The second most frequently used arrangement for current and prospective students across all age categories is "care by babysitter," and the third ranked arrangement is "child in school during hours you are away."

Forty-eight of the 222 current students, or 15.8 percent of 304 responses across age groupings, indicated that they are using campus child care services. This is approximately equivalent to the percentage of prospective students who are using some form of center-based care off-campus.

The licensed family day care home is the least used form of care for both current and prospective students.

Of the 48 current students who indicated that they are users of campus child care centers, 32 are using this form of child care for a child who is 2 1/2 - 5; 12 are using this arrangement for a child who is under 2 1/2; and 4 are using this service for a child who is 6 - 11 years of age. Center-based care, whether it is located on campus or in the community, is most prevalent for the 2 1/2 - 5 age group. Conversely, "care by family member, other relative or close friend" is least prevalent for children who are 2 1/2 - 5.

A comparison by region of the child care arrangements used by current and prospective students combined is presented in Table 6.

Table 6

USE - REGIONAL COMPARISON (Current and Prospective Students Combined)

Arrangements	REGION 1 (Suburban) (86 students)					REGION 2 (Urban) (126 students)					REGION 3 (Rural) (60 students)				
	Under 2½ N=19	2½-5 N=49	6-11 N=54	X age groups N=122	RANK*	Under 2½ N=31	2½-5 N=61	6-11 N=76	X age groups N=168	RANK*	Under 2½ N=18	2½-5 N=33	6-11 N=34	X age groups N=85	RANK*
	%	%	%	%		%	%	%	%		%	%	%	%	
1) Care by family member, other relative or close friend	94.7	75.5	61.1	72.1	1	83.9	78.7	82.9	81.5	1	72.2	51.5	67.6	62.4	1
2) Care by babysitter	68.4	46.9	38.9	46.7	2	48.4	50.8	51.3	50.6	2	22.2	36.4	38.2	34.1	3
3) Care by licensed family day care home (up to 6 children in babysitter's home)	5.3	2.0	0	1.6	8	6.5	1.6	1.3	2.4	7	0	3.0	0	1.2	7
4) Care by child care center or after-school center in community	5.3	14.3	1.9	7.4	5	9.7	21.3	5.3	11.9	4	0	3.0	2.9	2.4	6
5) Care by campus child care center(Current Stds. only)	0	4.1	3.7	3.3	7	0	13.1	2.6	6.0	6	66.7	66.7	0	40.0	2
6) You attend classes while child is in school	0	14.3	46.3	26.2	3	0	13.1	44.7	25.0	3	0	3.0	44.1	18.8	4
7) Child takes care of self	0	2.0	20.4	9.8	4	0	0	21.1	9.5	5	0	0	8.8	3.5	5
8) Other	0	8.2	5.6	5.7	6	6.5	0	2.6	2.4	7	0	0	0	0	

NOTE: N = number of students with one or more children in respective age groupings who indicated they are using one or more of child care arrangements listed.
Percentages for each column will total over 100 percent because of multiple responses.

*Rank order of most frequently used arrangements across-age groupings.

This table shows that although use patterns are fairly similar in each region, some differences relating to availability of campus child care should be noted. In Region 1, where on-site child care services are available only on a very limited basis--to women enrolled in a CETA program at the BOCES--use of Arrangement 1) "care by family member, other relative or close friend" and Arrangement 2) "care by babysitter" are fairly high. Similarly, in Region 2, where on-site child care services are available at one of the community college campuses but not at the other campus nor at the BOCES sites, on-site child care was not available to a substantial portion of the sample. Consequently, use of Arrangements 1) and 2) were correspondingly high. In Region 3, where on-site child care services were provided at the community college and were available to a larger segment of the sample, use of Arrangements 1) and 2), "care by family member, other relative or close friend" and "care by babysitter," was considerably lower than in the other two regions.

An overall use score was obtained for each respondent by assigning a weight to each of the child care arrangements. The weights ranged from 1 (intra-family arrangement) to 4 (extra-family arrangement). The weights for each arrangement checked by respondents were summed and the mean use score was obtained by dividing by the number of arrangements used. This was done first for each age category in which a respondent had a child; then one overall mean for each respondent was obtained. An overall mean use score was computed for current students and for prospective students. Subsequently, a t-test was performed to compare the use overall means (OM) for current and prospective students. It was determined that the use overall means of the two groups differed significantly at the .05 level. As shown in the following comparison, current students are using child care arrangements that are more extra-family in nature than those used by prospectives.

Comparison of Use Overall Means (OM)
of Current and Prospective Students

Use OM		t-value
Current	Prospective	
1.66	1.48	2.01*

$^*p < .05$
$^{**}p < .01$

NOTE: Use Overall Means range from 1 (use of intra-family arrangements) to 4 (use of extra-family arrangements)

Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Use. The Spearman rank-order correlation statistic was used to test relationships between demographic variables and respondents' use of the various kinds of child care arrangements. This was done for the total combined sample of current and prospective students. Significant correlations were found to exist between the use overall mean (OM) and respondents' age; income level; course load; class attendance measured in number of days and hours per week; and the presence of another adult in the household who is available to provide child care.

Respondents' age was correlated significantly with the use overall mean at the .001 level of significance ($r_s = -.22$, $p < .001$). As age decreased, use scores increased. This reflects the more frequent utilization of extra-family types of child care arrangements among younger women. Income level was also correlated with use at the .001 level of significance ($r_s = -.19$, $p < .001$). As income level decreased, use scores increased. This correlation suggests that respondents at the lower income levels are using child care arrangements that are more extra-family in nature than respondents at the higher income levels.

Course load and number of days and hours per week that respondents attend classes are additional variables that are significantly correlated with the use overall mean. Course load is correlated with use at the .001 level ($r_s = .31$, $p < .001$), indicating that there is greater use of extra-family child care arrangements among respondents who are carrying heavier course loads. Number of class attendance days per week is also correlated significantly with use ($r_s = .35$, $p < .001$), as is number of class attendance hours per week ($r_s = .26$, $p < .001$). These positive correlations indicate that those who attend classes a greater number of days and hours per week are using child care arrangements that are more extra-family in nature than those who attend fewer days and hours per week.

The presence or absence of another adult child care provider in the home is significantly correlated with the use overall mean ($r_s = .21$, $p < .001$). There is greater use of extra-family child care arrangements among those students who do not have other persons in the home available to provide child care.

Particular Features of Child Care. In order to better understand use of the various child care arrangements, respondents were also asked to provide information about selected features and characteristics of care, such as cost and proximity to home, school or place of work. The following summary indicates the weekly cost for current and prospective students of all child care arrangements used.

Cost of Child Care Per Week for All Children of Each Respondent

	CURRENT N = 203 %	PROSPECTIVE N = 48 %
No cost	36.5	45.8
Under $10	24.1	20.8
$10 - $20	22.7	20.8
$21 - $30	11.3	2.1
$31 - $40	3.9	4.2
$41 - $50	1.5	6.3
More than $50	0	0

This summary shows that the majority of respondents in both groups are paying $20 or less per week for all of their child care arrangements. A sizeable segment of both groups indicate that their child care arrangements do not cost anything. This is because some respondents are using only care by family member/relative and no other arrangement. More prospectives (45.8%) than currents (36.5%) are using cost-free arrangements. However, more prospective students (10.5%) than current students (5.4%) are using high-cost child care ($31 to $50 per week). This would seem to reflect the higher percentage of respondents in the prospective group who are working full time.

Table 7 (page 70) shows the proximity to home, measured in drive time, of all child care arrangements used by respondents for their children in the various age categories, as well as the proximity to school (for current students) or place of work (for prospective students), measured in drive time, of all child care arrangements used by respondents for their children in the various age categories. For each age category--under 2 1/2, 2 1/2 - 5, and 6 - 11--percentages of current students and prospective students who have identified each drive time category are indicated.

A comparison of both sets of data reveals that most respondents, current and prospective, are using child care arrangements that are less than 20 minutes drive time from both home and school or place of work. Both parts of Table 7 show that a greater percentage of current students than prospectives are using child care arrangements that are 30 minutes - 1 hour from either home, school or place of work.

Table 7

USE - Proximity to HOME of Child Care Arrangements Presently Being Used

	Child under 2½ years		Child 2½ - 5 years		Child 6 - 11 years	
Arrangements	Current N = 63	Prospective N = 20	Current N = 130	Prospective N = 26	Current N = 151	Prospective N = 44
	%	%	%	%	%	%
In own home	41.2	35.0	45.3	38.4	52.3	56.8
Less than 10 minutes	30.1	50.0	29.2	57.6	35.0	36.3
10 - 19 minutes	19.0	15.0	26.1	3.8	7.2	2.2
20 - 29 minutes	6.3	0	6.9	0	2.6	4.5
30 minutes - 1 hour	3.1	0	10.7	0	2.6	0
Over 1 hour	0	0	0	0	0	0

USE - Proximity to SCHOOL (Current Students) or PLACE OF WORK (Prospectives) of Child Care Arrangements Presently Being Used

	Child under 2½ years		Child 2½ - 5 years		Child 6 - 11 years	
Arrangements	Current N = 63	Prospective N = 20	Current N = 130	Prospective N = 26	Current N = 151	Prospective N = 44
	%	%	%	%	%	%
In own home	21.2	23.0	26.0	37.5	4.8	39.2
Less than 10 minutes	31.9	46.1	21.0	50.0	25.0	32.1
10 - 19 minutes	23.4	15.3	25.2	6.2	25.9	10.7
20 - 29 minutes	14.8	7.6	10.9	6.2	23.0	10.7
30 minutes - 1 hour	8.5	7.6	16.8	0	21.1	7.1
Over 1 hour	0	0	0	0	0	0

Satisfaction with Child Care Arrangements Presently Used

Current and prospective students evaluated each of the child care arrangements they are presently using by indicating their level of satisfaction in each case. Table 8 (page 72) presents for the total sample and for all three regions: 1) the number of respondents actually using each child care arrangement who expressed their satisfaction with it (multiple frequency noted on table); 2) the percentage of these respondents who are very satisfied, satisfied, unsatisfied or very unsatisfied with each arrangement; and 3) the mean satisfaction scores for each arrangement. Since respondents could evaluate as many arrangements as they were using, percentages in the vertical columns frequently exceed 100 percent.

Satisfaction scores range from 1 (very unsatisfied) to 4 (very satisfied). Mean scores were calculated for each arrangement. To obtain a total satisfaction score for each respondent, the scores for each evaluated arrangement were summed and then divided by the number of arrangements used. These individual means were used to calculate the satisfaction overall means (OM) for current and prospective students.

Table 8 (see page 72) shows that among current students, campus child care is the arrangement that elicits the highest level of satisfaction, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.83 for this item. Current students as a group are more highly satisfied with campus child care than they are with child care centers located in the community (mean satisfaction score, 3.35). Following campus child care, the arrangements that produce the highest levels of satisfaction are "care by a family member, other relative or close friend" (mean satisfaction score, 3.57) and "you attend classes while child is in school" (mean satisfaction score, 3.56).

Prospective students, in contrast to currents, are most highly satisfied with the "child in school" arrangement (mean satisfaction score, 3.67).

Table 8

SATISFACTION

Satisfaction with Child Care Arrangements Presently Used

	CURRENT STUDENTS (222)						PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS (50)					
		Satisfied		Unsatisfied				Satisfied		Unsatisfied		
Arrangement	Multiple Freq.	4 Very Sat.	3 Sat.	2 Unsat.	1 Very Unsat.	MEAN SCORES	Multiple Freq.	4 Very Sat.	3 Sat.	2 Unsat.	1 Very Unsat.	MEAN SCORES
	N	%	%	%	%		N	%	%	%	%	
1) Care by family member, other relative or close friend	170	62.9	31.8	4.7	.6	3.57	42	59.5	33.3	2.4	4.8	3.48
2) Care by babysitter	110	29.1	65.5	4.5	.9	3.23	29	31.0	55.2	6.9	6.9	3.10
3) Care by licensed family day care home (up to 6 children in babysitter's home)	7	28.6	28.6	42.9	0	2.86	2	50.0	50.0	0	0	3.50
4) Care by child care center or after-school center in community	23	47.8	39.1	13.0	0	3.35	11	45.5	36.4	18.2	0	3.27
5) Care by campus child care center* *Current students only	47	85.1	12.8	2.1	0	3.83	*	-	-	-	-	-
6) You attend classes while child is in school	59	61.0	35.6	1.7	1.7	3.56	18	66.7	33.3	0	0	3.67
7) Child takes care of self	29	17.2	31.0	27.6	24.1	2.41	10	10.0	50.0	30.0	10.0	2.60

REGIONAL COMPARISON (Current and Prospective Students Combined)

	REGION 1 (Suburban) N = 86						REGION 2 (Urban) N = 126						REGION 3 (Rural) N = 60					
		Satisfied		Unsatisfied				Satisfied		Unsatisfied				Satisfied		Unsatisfied		
Arrangement	Multiple Freq.	4 Very Sat.	3 Sat.	2 Unsat.	1 Very Unsat.	MEAN SCORES	Multiple Freq.	4 Very Sat.	3 Sat.	2 Unsat.	1 Very Unsat.	MEAN SCORES	Multiple Freq.	4 Very Sat.	3 Sat.	2 Unsat.	1 Very Unsat.	MEAN SCORES
	N	%	%	%	%		N	%	%	%	%		N	%	%	%	%	
1) Care by family member, other relative or close friend	68	60.3	30.9	7.4	1.5	3.50	102	59.8	35.3	2.9	2.0	3.52	42	71.4	26.2	2.4	0	3.69
2) Care by babysitter	43	37.2	55.8	2.3	4.7	3.25	71	23.9	67.6	7.0	1.4	3.14	25	32.0	64.0	4.0	0	3.28
3) Care by licensed family day care home (up to 6 children in babysitter's home)	2	100.0	0	0	0	2.00	5	20.0	40.0	40.0	0	2.80	2	0	50.0	50.0	0	2.50
4) Care by child care center or after-school center in community	8	50.0	12.5	37.5	0	3.12	22	50.0	40.9	9.1	0	3.40	4	25.0	75.0	0	0	3.25
5) Care by campus child care center* *Current students only	1	100.0	0	0	0	4.00	11	81.8	9.1	9.1	0	3.72	35	85.7	14.3	0	0	3.85
6) You attend classes while child is in school	22	45.5	50.0	0	4.5	3.36	40	72.5	25.0	2.5	0	3.70	15	60.0	40.0	0	0	3.60
7) Child takes care of self	16	12.5	6.3	43.8	37.5	1.93	21	19.0	52.4	19.0	9.5	2.80	2	0	100.0	0	0	3.00

NOTE: For each arrangement, percentages equal 100% across columns for current and prospective students.

MULTIPLE FREQUENCY: Respondents were asked to evaluate each child care arrangement they are actually using. The multiple frequency column indicates the number of respondents who are using each arrangement and who expressed their degree of satisfaction with it.
SCORING: Satisfaction scores range from 1 (Very Unsatisfied) to 4 (Very Satisfied). Mean scores were calculated for each arrangement.

Following the child in school arrangement, they are most satisfied with "care by licensed family day care home" (mean satisfaction score, 3.50) and "care by family member, other relative or close friend" (mean satisfaction score, 3.48).

Both current and prospective students are least satisfied with the arrangement "child takes care of self."

Use of the chi-square statistic to compare current and prospective students' levels of satisfaction for each arrangement reveals no significant differences between the two groups. There are instead some outstanding similarities, such as high satisfaction with the intra-family child care Arrangement 1 "care by family member, other relative or close friend." Sixty-three percent of current students and 60 percent of prospective students are very satisfied with this arrangement. Similarly, 87 percent of current students and 82 percent of prospective students are either very satisfied or satisfied with the extra-family child care Arrangement 4 "care by child care center in the community."

The regional comparison of satisfaction levels for each child care arrangement (see Table 8, page 72) reveals some similarities and some differences across regions.

Students in all three regions indicate they are highly satisfied with "care by campus child care center" (100% in Region 1, 82% in Region 2, and 86% in Region 3); and satisfied or very highly satisfied with "care by babysitter" (93% in Region 1, 92% in Region 2, and 96% in Region 3) and "you attend classes while child is in school" (96% in Region 1, 98% in Region 2, and 100% in Region 3).

Some contrasts exist from one region to another. Students in rural Region 3 are more satisfied (71% very satisfied) with the intra-family arrangement "care by family member, other relative or close friend" than are students in urban Region 2 (60% very satisfied) or suburban Region 1 (60% very satisfied). Satisfaction with "care by child care center or after-school center in the community" is lower in suburban Region 1 (63%) than in urban Region 2 and rural Region 3 (91% and 100% respectively).

Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Satisfaction. The Spearman rank-order correlation statistic was used to test relationships between selected demographic variables and respondents' level of satisfaction with the child care arrangements they are presently using. Significant correlations were found to exist between the satisfaction overall mean (OM) and respondents' class attendance measured in number of days and hours per week; and number of children in the 2 1/2 - 5 age group and in the 6 - 11 age group.

The number of days per week that respondents attend classes was correlated significantly with the satisfaction OM ($r_s = -.12$, $p < .05$), as was the number of hours of weekly class attendance ($r_s = -.15$, $p < .05$). These correlations were negative, indicating that those who attend classes more days and hours per week are generally less satisfied with the child care arrangements they are using than those who are attending fewer days and hours.

The number and ages of respondents' children were also correlated significantly in some instances with the satisfaction OM. Number of children in the 2 1/2 - 5 age category was correlated positively with satisfaction ($r_s = .15$, $p < .05$), while number of children in the 6 - 11 age category was correlated negatively with satisfaction ($r_s = -.14$, $p < .05$). These correlations indicate that respondents who have a child or children aged 2 1/2 - 5 are more highly satisfied with their child care arrangements than are respondents with a child or children in the 6 - 11 age group.

Preferences for Child Care Arrangements

Current and prospective students were asked to rank their first three preferences for child care arrangements if they could have any choice they wanted while they attend classes (current students), or if they were to return to school (prospectives). An analysis of the most frequently selected arrangements across rankings is provided in Table 9.

Table 9

PREFERENCES

Child Care Arrangements Preferred by Students Who Have Children in Specific Age Groupings

Arrangements	CURRENT STUDENTS (222)			PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS (50)		
	Child under 2½ N = 53	Child 2½ - 5 N = 118	Child 6 - 11 N = 133	Child under 2½ N = 15	Child 2½ - 5 N = 25	Child 6 - 11 N = 31
	%	%	%	%	%	%
1) Care by family member, close relative or friend	86.8	80.5	79.7	73.3	92.0	77.4
2) Care by babysitter	73.6	63.5	57.1	53.3	44.0	45.1
3) Care by licensed family day care home	50.9	44.0	36.8	40.0	24.0	12.9
4) Care by child care center or after school center in community	35.8	45.8	40.6	20.0	48.0	35.4
5) Care by campus child care center	71.7	72.9	44.3	60.0	76.0	51.6
6) You attend classes while child is in school	22.6	34.7	68.4	13.3	20.0	64.5
7) Child takes care of self	22.6	17.8	31.6	0	0	9.7

NOTE: N = number of Current or Prospective Students who have a child in the given age category.

Percents total over 100% for each column since each respondent was asked to indicate their first three preferences from among the seven arrangements listed.

Children Under 2 1/2 Years Old. Table 9 shows that for students with children in the under 2 1/2 age bracket, the most frequently chosen child care arrangements (those selected by 50% or more of respondents) were:

	CURRENT	PROSPECTIVE
Arrangement 1 - Care by family member, close relative or friend	87%	73%
Arrangement 2 - Care by babysitter	74%	53%
Arrangement 5 - Care by campus child care center	72%	60%

The majority of both current and prospective students preferred the traditional intra-family child care arrangement "care by family member, close relative or friend" for children in the under 2 1/2 age group. Current and prospective students differed in the second most frequently chosen arrangement for this age group. Seventy-four percent of current students chose the intra-family arrangement "care by babysitter," while 60 percent of prospectives preferred the extra-family arrangement "care by campus child care center." This arrangement, "care by campus child care center," was the third most preferred arrangement for current students (72%).

Children 2 1/2 - 5 Years Old. Table 9 (page 75) shows that for students with children in the 2 1/2 - 5 age group, the most frequently chosen child care arrangements (those selected by 50% or more of respondents) were:

	CURRENT	PROSPECTIVE
Arrangement 1 - Care by family member, close relative or friend	81%	92%
Arrangement 5 - Care by campus child care center	73%	76%
Arrangement 2 - Care by babysitter	64%	

The majority of both current and prospective students preferred the intra-family arrangement "care by family member, close relative or friend" for children 2 1/2 - 5 years of age, with prospectives indicating a stronger preference for this arrangement than currents. The second most frequently chosen arrangement by both groups for children 2 1/2 - 5 proved to be the extra-family arrangement "care by campus child care center," with approximately the same percentage of students in both groups selecting this option.

Children 6 - 11 Years Old. Table 9 (page 75) shows that for students with children in the 6 - 11 age category, the most frequently chosen child care arrangements (those selected by 50% or more of respondents) were:

	CURRENT	PROSPECTIVES
Arrangement 1 - Care by family member, close relative or friend	80%	77%
Arrangement 6 - You attend classes while child is in school	68%	65%
Arrangement 2 - Care by babysitter	57%	
Arrangement 5 - Care by campus child care center		52%

For their school-aged children, the majority of both current (80%) and prospective (77%) students preferred the traditional intra-family child care arrangement "care by family member, close relative or friend." The second most popular choice for both groups of respondents was having the youngsters in school while the parent attends classes (currents, 68%; prospectives, 65%), a choice most closely associated with intra-family child care since it is least disruptive to the family. Current and prospective students differed on their third most-preferred child care arrangement; 57 percent of current students chose the intra-family arrangement "care by babysitter," while 52 percent of prospective students opted for the extra-family arrangement "care by campus child care center."

A regional analysis of students' child care preferences shows fairly similar choices across the three regions and reflects the frequencies of the statewide sample of current and prospective students. Table 10 below shows the percentage of total responses across rankings by region for each arrangement.

Table 10

PREFERENCES - REGIONAL COMPARISON

Child Care Arrangements Preferred by Students Who Have Children in Specific Age Groupings

Arrangements	REGION 1 (86 students)			REGION 2 (126 students)			REGION 3 (60 students)		
	Child under 2½ N = 19	Child 2½ - 5 N = 49	Child 6 - 11 N = 54	Child under 2½ N = 31	Child 2½ - 5 N = 61	Child 6 - 11 N = 76	Child under 2½ N = 18	Child 2½ - 5 N = 33	Child 6 - 11 N = 34
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1) Care by family member, close relative or friend	73.7	83.7	79.6	87.0	81.9	78.9	88.8	81.8	79.4
2) Care by babysitter	73.7	65.3	62.9	70.9	59.0	53.9	61.1	54.5	44.1
3) Care by licensed family day care home	47.3	44.9	35.1	48.4	40.9	31.5	50.0	33.3	29.4
4) Care by child care center or after school center in community	42.1	44.9	44.4	38.7	47.5	34.2	11.1	45.4	44.1
5) Care by campus child care center	57.9	71.4	42.5	74.2	70.4	51.3	72.2	81.8	38.2
6) You attend classes while child is in school	15.8	38.8	70.3	29.0	29.5	65.8	11.1	27.2	67.6
7) Child takes care of self	10.5	25.6	29.6	25.8	13.1	26.3	11.1	9.0	26.4

NOTE: N = number of combined Current and Prospective Students from each region who have a child in the given age category.

Percents total over 100% for each column since each respondent was asked to indicate their first three preferences from among the seven arrangements listed.

As Table 10 indicates, the most frequently selected child care preference in each of the three regions for children in all three age categories was Arrangement 1, "care by family member, close relative or friend." Region 1 respondents indicated that the intra-family arrangement "care by babysitter" was an equally preferred choice with Arrangement 1, while Region 3 respondents identified the extra-family child care arrangement "care by campus child care center" as an equally preferred choice with Arrangement 1.

"Care by campus child care center" (Arrangement 5) was the second most frequently preferred arrangement for the under 2 1/2 and the 2 1/2 - 5 year olds in all three regions. "You attend classes while child is in school" (Arrangement 6) was the second most frequently selected arrangement for 6 - 11 year olds in all three regions.

In sum, the data from Table 9 and from Table 10 (regional comparisons) support the following conclusions: the intra-family child care arrangements "care by family member, close relative or friend," and "you attend classes while child is in school" are the predominant first choices of current and prospective students for children in all three age groupings. The popularity of campus child care in the rankings indicated an openness on the part of current and prospective students to this particular type of extra-family arrangement for their under 2 1/2 and 2 1/2 - 5 year old children.

Many of those expressing a preference for extra-family, center-based child care emphasized the importance of qualified staff, as well as socialization and learning experiences for the child. Campus child care had an additional appeal for some respondents because their children would be "close by--right there" with them while they attend classes. These reasons are illustrated in the following comment by an interviewee:

> It's too bad all the colleges can't have a day care center on campus. More people could get a chance at education plus have peace of mind knowing their child was nearby in an emergency and being well cared for.

Those who expressed a preference for care by relatives or family cited trust and ability to care for the child when sick as the reasons for their choice. It was observed that this kind of care had drawbacks such as lack of socialization and learning experiences which group care could provide. One respondent commented that when a friend or relative cares for your child, "you can't demand what you want for your child without causing hard feelings."

Some respondents stated that although they preferred home-based care by a relative or sitter for the very young child, they would choose center-based care, if available, for a 3 - 5 year old. They would consider removing the child from the home at that time because of the "learning experiences and recreation" available in the child care center.

Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Preferences. The Spearman rank-order correlation statistic was used to test relationships between demographic variables and child care preferences. This was done for the total combined sample of current and prospective students. Significant correlations were found to exist between the preference overall mean (OM) and respondents' age; income level; course load; class attendance measured in number of days per week; and the presence or absence of another adult in the home who is available to provide child care.

Respondents' age was found to be significantly correlated with their child care preferences ($r_s = -.14$, $p < .05$). Those in the younger age groups tended to have higher preference scores reflecting preferences for extra-family types of chld care arrangements. A significant correlation was also obtained for income level and the preference overall mean ($r_s = -.16$, $p < .01$). As income decreased, preference scores increased, which indicates that lower income women expressed preferences for more extra-family types of child care than did higher income women.

Course load and number of days per week that respondents attend classes were found to be correlated significantly with preferences. Course load was correlated at the .001 level ($r_s = .31$, $p < .001$) with the preferences overall mean. Those students taking heavier course loads tended to have child care preferences that were more extra-family in nature. Number of class attendance days per week was also correlated with preferences

(r_s = .14, $p < .05$). It would appear that the more days each week that a student attends classes, the more extra-family her child care preferences are.

A high correlation was found to exist between respondents' child care preferences and the presence or absence of another adult in the home who is available to provide child care (r_s = .25, $p < .001$). Those who do not have such a child care provider in the home have more extra-family child care preferences than those who do.

Attitudes Toward the Extra-Family Care of Children

Attitudes are defined, for purposes of this study, as feelings, beliefs and action-tendencies of respondents regarding the extra-family care of children. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their agreement or disagreement with six statements regarding the care of children by family and by strangers and the presence or absence of parents from the home. Table 11 (page 82) shows the percentage of current and prospective students who agreed, disagreed or held no opinion with respect to each of the six attitudinal statements.

Scores for each statement range from 1 - 5, the higher end of the range indicating attitudes that are favorable to the extra-family care of children, the lower end of the range indicating attitudes that are unfavorable. Agreement with attitudinal statements 1, 3 and 5 reflects attitudes that are favorable to the extra-family care of children. The scoring of attitudes 2, 4 and 6 has been reversed so that agreement with statements 2, 4 and 6 indicates attitudes that are unfavorable to the extra-family care of children.

Responses to attitudinal statements 1-6, as indicated by the mean scores, reflect an ambivalence on the part of respondents toward working mothers and the care of children.

TABLE 11 ATTITUDES

Attitudes toward the Extra-Family Care of Children

Attitudes	CURRENT STUDENTS n=222				PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS N=50			
	Agree Strongly A.	No Opinion	Disagree Strongly D.	MEAN SCORE (Range: 1-5)	Agree Strongly A.	No Opinion	Disagree Strongly D.	MEAN SCORE (Range: 1-5)
	%	%	%		%	%	%	
1) Day care makes a family stronger.	29	39	30	2.96	34	30	34	2.98
*2) Working mothers miss the best years of their children's lives.	55	5	39	2.73	56	4	38	2.69
3) Taking children out of the home to someone else is good for children because it helps them to learn how to get along with others.	78	6	15	3.77	78	8	12	3.74
*4) Only a relative or very close friend can be trusted to take care of your children when you are away from home.	15	8	75	3.70	22	2	74	3.71
5) Working mothers enjoy the time they spend with their children more than if they were with them all day.	50	13	36	3.26	66	10	22	3.67
*6) Day care might be convenient for parents but it is often harmful to the child.	17	16	64	3.63	20	10	68	3.49

Percentages may not equal 100% due to missing data.

NOTE: Scores for each attitude statement range from 1-5. In calculating the means, the scoring has been adjusted so that the higher score indicates favorable attitudes toward the extra-family care of children. Scoring of Attitudes 1, 3, 5 ranges from 5 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree).
*Reversed items: Scoring of Attitudes 2, 4, 6 ranges from 1 (Strongly Agree) to 5 (Strongly Disagree).

Attitudinal statements 2 and 5, dealing with working mothers, elicited the highest frequency of intra-family responses, as indicated by lower mean scores for both current and prospective students. Attitudinal statement 1, focusing on the effect of day care on families, also elicited a relatively strong intra-family response. These responses would seem to indicate a reluctance of mothers to leave their children in the care of others and an underlying feeling that entrusting one's children to extra-family types of care does not contribute to a family's strength and stability.

On the other hand, respondents' reactions to statements 3, 4 and 6 reveal a recognition that some extra-family child care arrangements can be safe and dependable as well as desirable and beneficial to the child. The higher mean scores on items 3, 4 and 6 indicate attitudes that are somewhat more extra-family in nature.

Table 11 (page 82) also shows the percentage of current and prospective students who agreed, disagreed or held no opinion with respect to each of the six attitude statements. The only significant difference that was found to exist between current and prospective students was in their response to attitude statement 4, "Only a relative or very close friend can be trusted to take care of your children when you are away from home." The mean scores of current and prospective students were compared for this item using the chi-square statistic and the difference between the two groups was found to be significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = 10.90$, $p < .05$). A greater proportion of prospective students (22%) than current students (15%) agreed with statement 4, suggesting that prospective students as a group are somewhat less inclined than current students to accept extra-family child care arrangements.

A regional comparison of student responses to the six attitudinal statements reveals very similar attitudes across the three regions. Because there were few differences to note, a table showing a regional comparison on this variable has not been included.

To obtain a total attitude score for each respondent, the scores for each attitudinal statement were summed and then divided by the number of statements to obtain the individual mean. An overall mean was then calculated for current students and for prospective students. The attitudes of current and prospective students toward the extra-family care of children were compared, using the t-test. Although a significant difference had been identified with respect to attitude statement 4, no significant difference was found to exist between the overall attitude mean of the current student group and that of the prospective student group. Current and prospective students as a group tended to have similar, slightly favorable attitudes toward the extra-family care of children.

Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Attitudes. The Spearman rank-order correlation statistic was used to test relationships between demographic variables and student attitudes toward the extra-family care of children. Significant correlations were found to exist between the attitude overall mean (OM) for current and prospective students combined and respondents' age; income level; course load; class attendance measured in number of days and hours per week; extent of employment; and the existence of another adult in the household who is available to provide child care.

The age of respondents was correlated with the attitude overall mean at the .05 level of significance ($r_s = -.12$, $p < .05$). As age decreased, attitude scores increased, reflecting attitudes that are more favorable to the extra-family care of children. Income level was also correlated significantly with the attitude overall mean ($r_s = -.14$, $p < .05$). As income level decreased, attitude scores increased. This suggests that respondents at the lower income levels have attitudes that are more favorable to the extra-family care of children.

Course load and number of days and hours per week that respondents attended classes are items that were significantly correlated with the attitude overall mean. Course load was correlated at the .001 level of significance ($r_s = .25$, $p < .001$). Those carrying heavier course loads had more favorable attitudes toward the extra-family care of children. Significant correlations were found between the attitude overall mean and number of class attendance days per week ($r_s = .15$, $p < .05$) and number of class attendance hours per week ($r_s = .11$, $p < .05$). These correlations indicate that respondents who are attending classes more days and more hours each week have attitudes that are more favorable to the extra-family care of children than those who are attending fewer days and hours.

Employment was also found to be correlated with the attitude overall mean ($r_s = -.15$, $p < .05$). Those who work daytime or weekday hours were found to hold more favorable attitudes toward the extra-family care of children than those who work evenings, nights or weekends.

The presence or absence of another adult in the home to provide child care when needed was also significantly correlated with respondents' attitudes toward the extra-family care of children ($r_s = .11$, $p < .05$). Those who do not have such a child care provider in the home have attitudes that are more favorable to the extra-family care of children than those who do.

Awareness of Available Child Care Services

Table 12A and B indicate student awareness of the various types of child care arrangements. Current students were asked whether they knew if any of these arrangements were available to them while they attend classes. Prospective students were asked whether they would be available to them if they were to return to school. Table 12A presents current students' perceptions of the availability of child care services while they attend classes and prospective students' perceptions of services available to them if they were to return to school. Perception of availability was measured by a response of "yes," "no," "sometimes," or "don't know" for each of the child care arrangements. Table 12B summarizes for current and prospective students their awareness of available child care services. Student awareness was measured by recoding the responses for perception of availability. "Yes" (3), "no" (1), "sometimes" (2) were equated with awareness and recoded as a (2). "Don't know" was equated with unawareness and recoded as a (1).

Table 12

AWARENESS

A. Perception of Available Child Care Services

Arrangements	CURRENT STUDENTS N = 222				PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS N = 50			
	3 Yes	1 No	2 Sometimes	0 Don't Know	3 Yes	1 No	2 Sometimes	0 Don't Know
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1) Care by family member, other relative, close friend	34.7	18.0	44.1	.5	50.0	18.0	30.0	2.0
2) Care by babysitter	21.6	39.2	29.3	5.0	52.0	18.0	18.0	12.0
3) Care by licensed daycare home	7.2	64.0	1.8	19.4	24.0	20.0	0	56.0
4) Care by child care center or after school center in community	17.6	54.1	4.5	16.7	36.0	30.0	4.0	30.0
5) Care by campus child care	23.0	53.6	2.3	16.2	26.0	26.0	2.0	46.0
6) other	1.8	1.8	1.4	91.4	4.0	6.0	0	90.0

B. Awareness of Available Child Care Services

Arrangements	CURRENT STUDENTS N = 222		PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS N = 50	
	$\overbrace{3,1,2}^{2}$ Aware	$\overbrace{0}^{1}$ Unaware	$\overbrace{3,1,2}^{2}$ Aware	$\overbrace{0}^{1}$ Unaware
	%	%	%	%
1) Care by family member, other relative, close friend	96.8	.5	98.0	2.0
2) Care by babysitter	90.0	5.0	88.0	12.0
3) Care by licensed family day care home	73.0	19.4	44.0	56.0
4) Care by child care center or after school center in community	76.1	16.7	70.0	30.0
5) Care by campus child care center	78.8	16.2	54.0	46.0
6) Other	5.0	91.4	10.0	90.0

NOTE: Percentages may not equal 100% due to missing data.

Table 12A shows that more students perceive that intra-family arrangements (1 and 2) are available to them than are extra-family arrangements (3, 4 and 5). This perception of availability is based upon the combined percentages of the "yes" and "sometimes" responses for each arrangement.

Table 12B shows that all students, current and prospective, were generally more aware of those child care arrangements that are more intra-family in nature, such as care by family member, other relative or close friend (97% current; 98% prospectives) or care by babysitter (90% current; 88% propsectives). Conversely both current and prospective students were less aware of the more formal, organized extra-family types of arrangements such as care by center in community (76% current; 70% prospectives). Both groups of students were least aware of arrangement 3, "care by a licensed family day care home" (73% current; 44% prospective).

Table 13 below presents a regional comparison of student awareness of child care services and shows fairly similar awareness profiles across the three regions.

Table 13

AWARENESS - REGIONAL COMPARISON (Current and Prospective Students Combined)

Awareness of Available Child Care Services

	REGION 1 (Suburban)		REGION 2 (Urban)		REGION 3 (Rural)	
	N = 86		N = 126		N = 60	
	2	1	2	1	2	1
Arrangements	3,1,2 Aware	0 Unaware	3,1,2 Aware	0 Unaware	3,1,2 Aware	0 Unaware
	%	%	%	%	%	%
1) Care by family member, other relative, close friend	96.5	1.2	96.8	.8	98.3	0
2) Care by babysitter	89.5	8.1	92.0	5.6	85.0	5.0
3) Care by licensed family day care home	70.9	24.4	65.0	31.0	68.3	18.3
4) Care by child care center or after school center in community	82.6	15.1	71.4	24.6	71.7	13.3
5) Care by campus child care center	75.6	22.1	66.7	30.2	88.3	3.3
6) Other	6.0	90.7	3.2	90.5	0	93.3

NOTE: Percentages may not equal 100% due to missing data.

Students from all three regions are equally aware of the intra-family child care arrangement 1, "care by family member, other relative or close friend." Students from Region 3 appear to be slightly less aware of arrangement 2, "care by babysitter," (85%) as compared to Region 1 (90%) and Region 2 (92%). Students from urban Region 2 are less aware of all three of the extra-family child care arrangements (3, 4 and 5) compared to students from Regions 1 and 3. Students in rural Region 3 (88%) are most aware of arrangement 5, "care by campus child care center" compared to

Region 1 (76%) and Region 2 (67%).

Additional analyses of data for the total sample reveal that current students as a group are more aware of available child care arrangements than are prospective students. For each child care arrangement, a respondent could have an awareness score of either a 2 (aware) or a 1 (unaware). A mean awareness score was obtained for each respondent by summing the scores for all arrangements and dividing by the number of arrangements. Overall mean awareness scores with a range of 1 - 2 were obtained for current and for prospective students. These are referred to as the awareness overall means (OM).

A t-test was performed to compare the awareness overall means for current and prospective students. It was determined that the awareness overall means of the two groups are significantly different at the .05 level as shown below:

Comparison of Awareness Overall Means (OM)
of Current and Prospective Students

Awareness OM		t-value
Current	Prospective	
1.70	1.61	2.74**

---

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$

NOTE: Awareness Overall Mean range is from 1 (unaware) to 2 (aware)

Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Awareness. The Spearman rank-order correlation statistic was used to test relationships between selected demographic variables and respondents' awareness of the child care arrangements available to them while they attend classes. Some significant correlations were found to exist between the awareness overall mean (OM) and respondents' age; income level; class attendance measured in number of days per week; the existence of another adult in the household who is available to provide child care; and the time it takes to drive from home to school.

Respondents' age was significantly correlated with the awareness overall mean ($r_s = -.13$, $p < .05$). As age decreased, awareness scores increased, indicating greater awareness among younger women. A significant correlation was also found to exist between income level and the awareness overall mean ($r_s = -.14$, $p < .05$). Lower income respondents tended to be more aware of available child care arrangements than were higher income respondents. It was found that class attendance (number of days per week) was correlated with awareness at the .01 level of significance ($r_s = .16$, $p < .01$). As the number of class attendance days per week increased so did the degree of awareness.

The presence or absence of another adult in the home to provide child care when needed was correlated significantly with respondents' awareness of available child care arrangements ($r_s = .13$, $p < .05$). Those who do not have another adult child care provider living in the home are more aware of the various child care arrangements available to them than are those with such an adult in the home.

Drive time from students' home to class was also significantly correlated with the awareness overall mean ($r_s = .14$, $p < .05$). As the drive time increased, so did awareness. Therefore, it may be concluded that those who have a longer drive time from home to class are somewhat more aware of the child care arrangements available to them while they attend classes than those with a shorter drive time.

Informal comments during interviews and on questionnaires indicated that many respondents were generally aware of the varied conditions that influence the availability of a particular kind of child care arrangement for them. Age and cost limitations are two conditions that are particularly critical for families with more than one child. One single head of household observed that center-based child care services "are not available for my two-year old and the expense is too great for my four-year old. And there is no child care available for my ten-year old after school so she is on her own for about one hour until I get home from school."

Another perceived limitation on availability of care was lack of evening hours at child care centers on campus or in the community. Some respondents identified still another kind of limitation on the availability of campus child care. A parent who is eligible to receive day care assistance funds under Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) or under Title XX cannot receive this money if she places her child in an unlicensed day care center. Some campus child care centers are not licensed and are, therefore, unavailable to parents who are eligible for this subsidy.

Comparison of Overall Means for Current and Prospective Students' Use, Satisfaction, Awareness, Attitudes and Preferences

Mean scores were obtained for current students and for prospective students on each of the major variables. For use, preferences, and attitudes a high mean (relative to the score range) signifies extra-family child care favorability; a low mean score represents intra-family child care favorability. For satisfaction and awareness, a high mean score simply indicates higher satisfaction and greater awareness than a low mean score.

The mean scores of current and prospective students were compared, using the t-test, to determine whether there were significant differences between the two groups in their child care attitudes, use, preferences, awareness and satisfaction. Table 14 shows the score range, the mean scores of current and prospective students, and the t-value for each of the major variables.

Table 14

MAJOR VARIABLES: COMPARISON OF OVERALL MEANS (OM) BETWEEN CURRENT AND PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS

Variable	Score Range	Mean Scores Current (N=222)	 Prospective (N=[illegible]0)	t-Value
- Attitudes OM	1 - 4	3.34	3.38	-.36
- Awareness OM	1 - 2	1.70	1.61	2.74**
- Satisfaction OM	1 - 4	3.46	3.37	.99
- Use OM	1 - 4	1.66	1.48	2.01*
OM for children under 2½ years old	1 - 4	1.79	1.59	1.01
OM for children 2½ - 5 years old	1 - 4	2.01	1.67	1.90
OM for children 6 - 11 years old	1 - 4	1.26	1.39	-1.83
- Preferences OM	2 - 7.67	4.30	4.25	.19
OM for children under 2½ years old	2 - 7.67	4.44	4.51	-.20
OM for children 2½ - 5 years old	2 - 7.67	4.63	4.74	-.30
OM for children 6 - 11 years old	2 - 7.67	3.46	3.73	-.94

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$

Both groups of respondents have attitudes that are fairly favorable to the extra-family care of children, as evidenced by their mean scores for attitudes. Current students are more aware than are prospective students of the child care arrangements that are available to them while they attend classes. Table 14 indicates that the awareness difference between current and prospective groups is significant at the .01 level. Current students are more aware than prospective students of available child care services.

Both current and prospective students are fairly satisfied with the arrangements they are using. There is very little difference in level of satisfaction between the two groups.

As seen in the table, the preferences of current and prospective students are similar. The scores of both groups are about midway in the range between intra-family and extra-family preferences. The highest preference scores for both groups, indicating preferences for child care arrangements that are more extra-family in nature, are for children in the 2 1/2 - 5 age category. The lowest preference scores, indicating preferences that are more intra-family in nature, are for school-aged children 6 - 11 years old.

Although both current and prospective students are using child care arrangements that are fairly intra-family in nature, current students are using arrangements that are more extra-family and institutional in nature than prospective students. Table 14 indicates that the use difference between current and prospective students is significant at the .05 level.

C. Users versus Nonusers of On-Site Child Care Services

In an effort to define and describe those who would be likely to use on-site child care services if they were to be provided where they are not presently available, a comparison was made of users and nonusers of on-site child care at sites where these services are offered. Forty-four users of on-site child care services were identified in the current student population at two of the Community College campuses. An additional 53 students at these same sites were identified as nonusers of on-site child care services. The nonuser group includes prospective students referred through the college administration, as well as currently enrolled spouses and other students. The demographic profile, child care attitudes, and child care preferences of user and nonuser groups were compared to determine how they were the same and how they were different.

Selected demographic items for the two groups were compared using the chi-square statistic. Table 15 (page 93) presents demographic data for

Table 15

Campus Child Care Service Users Vs. Nonusers: Comparison of Selected Demographics

Variables	User (N=44)[a]	Nonuser (N=53)	
Age:			
Under 25	22.7%	5.7%	
25 - 34	61.4%	66.0%	
35 - 44	13.6%	26.4%	
45 - 54	2.3%	1.9%	
Marital Status:			
Single	6.8%	5.7%	
Married	72.7%	75.5%	
Widowed/Separated/Divorced	20.5%	18.9%	
Highest Level of Education:			
10th grade	2.3%	1.9%	
High school	36.4%	38.5%	
1 year college	29.5%	19.2%	
2 years college	11.4%	13.5%	
4 years college	2.3%	9.6%	
Other	18.2%	17.3%	
Relative Available to Care for Child:			**
Yes	13.6%	45.3%	
No	86.4%	54.7%	
Relationship of Relative to Student:			
Spouse	100.0%	79.2%	
Parent	0.0%	12.5%	
Older child	0.0%	4.2%	
Friend	0.0%	4.2%	
Time It Takes Student to Drive From Home to Class:			**
Under 10 minutes	27.3%	13.2%	
10 - 19 minutes	36.4%	73.6%	
20 - 29 minutes	13.6%	9.4%	
30 - 60 minutes	22.7%	3.8%	
Class Attendance Period:			***
Days	65.1%	64.7%	
Evenings	0.0%	29.4%	
Both	34.9%	5.9%	
Number of Days Per Week Student Attends Class:			*
1 day	0.0%	17.6%	
2 days	2.3%	11.8%	
3 days	25.6%	17.6%	
4 days	14.0%	5.9%	
5 days	58.1%	47.1%	
Course Load:			**
1 course	16.7%	30.6%	
2 courses	14.3%	44.9%	
3 courses	23.8%	8.2%	
4 courses	26.2%	10.2%	
5 courses	14.3%	4.1%	
6 courses	2.4%	2.0%	
7 courses	2.4%	0.0%	
Employment:			**
Yes	29.5%	60.4%	
No	70.5%	39.6%	
Employment Schedule:			**
Days	0.0%	53.1%	
Mornings	25.0%	6.3%	
Afternoons	8.3%	3.1%	
Evenings	16.7%	6.3%	
Nights	8.3%	0.0%	
Weekends	8.3%	0.0%	
Variable	33.3%	31.3%	
Income:			
Under $5,000	13.6%	5.8%	
$5,000 - 10,000	27.3%	9.6%	
$10,000 - 15,000	20.5%	26.9%	
$15,000 - 20,000	20.5%	21.2%	
Over $20,000	18.2%	36.5%	

---

[a] An additional four respondents who are users of on-site child care at a BOCES were not included in the group of users because this BOCES center serves only a special population of CETA women.

*Chi-square value significant at .05
**Chi-square value significant at .01
***Chi-square value significant at .001

users and nonusers and identifies those items that were found to be significantly different for the two groups.

Table 15 reveals that users and nonusers of on-site child care services differ significantly with respect to availability of child care provider at home, commuting time, class attendance period, number of class attendance days per week, course load and employment.

A substantially higher percentage of users (86.4%) than nonusers (54.7%) do not have a relative available in the home to provide child care. This difference was found to be significant at the .01 level ($X^2 = 9.84$, $p < .01$). Student drive time from home to class was also found to differ significantly for the two groups at the .01 level ($X^2 = 15.66$, $p < .01$). Users of on-site child care services tend to live farther away from campus than nonusers. In the 30 - 60 minute drive time category were 22.7 percent of users as opposed to 3.8 percent of nonusers. Sixty-four percent of users live less than 20 minutes from campus, while as many as 87 percent of nonusers are in this category.

The significant difference between users and nonusers with respect to day or evening class attendance ($X^2 = 16.49$, $p < .001$) can be explained by the fact that on-site child care services are not available to users during the evening hours. Therefore, data show no students from the user population attending evening classes.

An analysis of the number of class attendance days per week and course load for both groups reveals that users are taking more courses and are attending classes more days per week than are nonusers. These differences were found to be statistically significant ($X^2 = 19.45$, $p < .01$; $X^2 = 11.04$, $p < .05$). Among users, 66.7 percent are taking 3 - 6 courses, while only 31 percent are taking one or two courses. For nonusers, the percentages are nearly reversed (24.5%, 3 - 6 courses; 75.5%, 1 or 2). Over 97 percent of users of on-site child care are attending classes 3 - 5 days per week, while only 2.3 percent are attending 2 days or less. In contrast, only 70.6 percent of nonusers attend class 3 - 5 days per week, while as many as 29.4 percent attend 2 days or less.

More nonusers of on-site child care services are employed than are users ($X^2 = 7.99$, $p < .01$). Of those nonusers who are employed, 53 percent work full days, while none of the employed users work full days. This significant difference between users and nonusers ($X^2 = 15.98$, $p < .01$) can be explained by the fact that those who work all day can only attend classes in the evening. Since on-site child care services at these particular sites are offered days only, this would exclude full-day employees from the pool of users.

The following summary shows the percentage of on-site child care users and nonusers who have children in each of the age categories.

Number of Students with Children

	Users N = 44	Nonusers N = 53
Under 2 1/2 years	(12) 27%	(15) 28%
2 1/2 - 5 years	(33) 75%	(25) 47%
6 - 11 years	(20) 45%	(32) 60%
12 and over	(5) 11%	(19) 36%

It should be noted that a higher percentage of users (75%) than nonusers (47%) have children in the 2 1/2 - 5 age group. For the older age categories, the situation is reversed. A higher percentage of nonusers than users have children in the 6 - 11 and 12 and over age groups; 36 percent of nonusers have children 12 and over as compared to only 11 percent of users. These older children of nonusers may be acting as child care providers (babysitters) for younger siblings, possibly explaining why these respondents are not using campus child care.

In order to determine whether any significant differences exist between the child care attitudes of users of on-site child care services and those of nonusers, the responses of both groups to the six attitudinal statements were compared, using the chi-square statistic. Only statements 4 and 6 elicited a significantly different response from users and nonusers ($X^2 = 10.68$, $p < .05$; $X^2 = 10.79$, $p < .05$).

In response to statement 4, "Only a relative or very close friend can be trusted to take care of your children when you are away from home," 15.4 percent of nonusers indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed, while only 2.3 percent of users signified agreement. Conversely, 98 percent of users and 83 percent of nonusers disagreed with the statement. This would appear to indicate a greater reluctance on the part of the nonuser group and a greater willingness among users to entrust their children to the care of nonrelatives or strangers. In response to statement 6, "Day care might be convenient for parents, but it is often harmful to the child," 15.3 percent of nonusers indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed, compared to only 4.6 percent of users. Similarly, more users (86.4%) than nonusers (75%) disagreed with this statement. It appears, from this comparison, that nonusers as a group tend to have less confidence in the quality of institutional child care for their children and attach more negative feelings to the word "day care" than do users.

The child care preferences of the user and nonuser groups were compared for extra-family favorability. The preference overall means of both groups were compared using the t-test, as shown in the following summary.

Preference Overall Mean (OM)

	User N = 44	Nonuser N = 53	t-value
OM for students with children under 2 1/2 years old	5.15	4.29	2.06*
OM for students with children 2 1/2 - 5 years old	5.24	4.85	.96
OM for students with children 6 - 11 years old	3.31	3.74	-1.14
OM across age groupings	5.05	4.25	2.69**

NOTE: Preference mean score range is from 2 (intra-family) to 7.67 (extra-family)
*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$

The preference overall mean across all three age groupings is significantly higher for users (5.05) than for nonusers (4.25), indicating that users are expressing child care preferences that are considerably more extra-family in nature than the preferences of nonusers. There is a significant difference between the child care preferences of users and those of nonusers with children in the under 2 1/2 age group ($t = 2.06$, $p < .05$). This shows that the child care preferences of users, even for their infants and toddlers, are considerably more extra-family in nature than the preferences of nonusers. The exception to this pattern is in the 6 - 11 year age category. Here, users express preferences that are more intra-family than those expressed for children in the other age groupings and than those expressed for the 6 - 11 year olds by nonusers. This preference reversal might be explained by the possible influence of use on preferences. Those who are already using on-site child care services for their pre-school children realize the inappropriateness of the pre-school program and hours for their older school-aged children. Nonusers are less likely to associate campus child care with a particular age grouping and are, therefore, freer to state a preference unaffected by experience.

As part of the effort to define and describe users and nonusers of on-site child care services, nonusers' awareness of these services was evaluated. Sixty-six percent of the nonuser group reported that they were aware of the existence and availability of campus child care, while 34 percent said that they were not aware of these services.

D. Summary of Phase Two Findings

The Phase Two survey of current and prospective female occupational education students at selected sites collected information to determine: the demographic profile of the target population; student child care attitudes and preferences for particular types of child care services; the actual child care arrangements students are using and their satisfaction with these arrangements; student awareness of existing on-site and off-campus child care services and their willingness to use campus child care where it is available; and student perceptions of child care needs as a barrier to program access and retention. The following findings emerged from this in-depth student survey:

Perception of Barriers

1. The majority of the 222 current (60%) and 50 prospective (54%) students in the total sample identified child care needs as a condition that makes it difficult for them to attend classes. The second most frequently identified actual or potential barrier to class attendance was money (45% current, 46% prospective). Most of those who identified child care needs as a barrier did so because it is unavailable to them at the times when it is needed.

2. At campuses where on-site child care services are not provided, 46 percent of the current student sample and 64 percent of the prospective students indicated that they would use on-site child care if it were available at a cost of $1.00 per hour. Of the current students indicating their willingness to use on-site child care, 32 percent felt that child care availability might change their educational plans sometime in the future; 23 percent might currently attend classes days instead of evenings; 27 percent might enroll in additional day or evening courses; and the remainder indicated that their plans would not be

affected at all by child care availability. Eighteen percent of these students indicated that on-site child care might also make a difference to other adult members of their household if they were to consider enrolling in classes.

Awareness of Available Child Care Services

3. Both current and prospective students are generally more aware of intra-family types of child care (family member, babysitter, etc.) than they are of the more formal, extra-family arrangements. Current students as a group are more aware of available child care arrangements than are prospective students.

4. A substantial number (34%) of the nonusers of on-site child care at sites where these services are provided reported that they are unaware of the existence and availability of on-site child care services.

Use of Child Care Arrangements

5. The child care arrangement that is more frequently used by current and prospective students for children under 2 1/2, 2 1/2 - 5 and 6 - 11 is "care by family member, other relative or close friend." The second most frequently used arrangement is "care by babysitter" and the third is having the child in school while the parent is away. Although both current and prospective students are using fairly intra-family types of child care services, the arrangements made by current students are more extra-family and institutional in nature than those made by prospective students.

6. Among all current and prospective students, the use of extra-family, center-based care, on or off-campus, is most prevalent for children in the 2 1/2 - 5 age group; care by a family member or friend is least prevalent for this age group.

7. Most of the current and prospective students are using child care arrangements that are less than 20 minutes drive time from both home and school or work place.

Satisfaction with Child Care Arrangements Presently Used

8. On-site child care is the most satisfying of all the child care arrangements used by current students; students are more satisfied with on-site services than with child care centers located off-campus. Following on-site child care, they are most satisfied with care by family, relative or friend and attending classes while child is in school.

Preferences for Child Care Arrangements

9. The intra-family child care arrangements, "care by family member, other relative or close friend" and "you attend classes while child is in school" are the most frequently indicated preferences of current and prospective students for their children in all age groups. These are followed closely by on-site child care. The popularity of on-site child care as a preference indicates an openness to this arrangement on the part of students and prospective students who might otherwise prefer intra-family types of child care.

Attitudes Toward the Extra-Family Care of Children

10. Current and prospective students tend to have similar, slightly favorable attitudes toward the extra-family care of children; however, there seem to be some mixed attitudes toward working mothers and the extra-family care of children. In one sense, students seem reluctant to leave their children in the care of others; in another sense, they recognize that some extra-family child care arrangements can be safe and dependable as well as desirable and beneficial to the child.

11. Users of on-site child care services have more favorable attitudes toward the extra-family care of children than do nonusers. Nonusers as a group appear to have less confidence in the quality of institutional child care for their children and attach more negative feelings to the word "day care" than do users. Users also express child care preferences that are more extra-family in nature than those of nonusers, especially for their 2 1/2 - 5 and under 2 1/2 year old children. For their older, school-aged children however, the user group preferences are not as extra-family as their preferences for children in the younger age categories.

Correlations between Demographic Variables and Child Care Attitudes, Preferences, Use and Awareness

12. In general, younger, lower-income respondents who do not have other adults living at home available to provide child care and who are carrying a heavier course load and attending classes a greater number of hours and days per week:

    - have attitudes that are more favorable to the extra-family care of children;

    - prefer the more institutional, extra-family types of child care arrangements;

    - use the more institutional, extra-family types of child care arrangements;

- are more aware than other respondents of the range of child care arrangements that are available to them while they attend classes.

Profile of Users of On-Site Child Care

13. Users of on-site child care services are less likely than nonusers to be employed and to have another adult in the home available to provide child care. If they are employed, they are much more likely than nonusers to work part-time or evenings rather than whole days. Users attend classes more days per week and carry a heavier course load. There are no users attending classes less than two days a week. A greater proportion of users than nonusers travel longer distances between home and school. More users than nonusers are in the under 25 age category, and more users than nonusers have incomes of less than $10,000 a year, although these two differences were not found to be statistically significant. More users than nonusers have children 2 1/2 - 5, and fewer users than nonusers have children who are 12 and over.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This project has identified child care services provided at the target agencies (New York State Community Colleges, BOCES and Big Five City School Districts) and child care services desired by the target population--women with children under the age of 12 who are enrolled in or who are considering enrolling in occupational education programs at these agencies. Indications of what exists and what is desired have emerged from program descriptions and perceptions of faculty and administrators regarding student child care needs at provider and potential provider agencies (schools that are or are not presently providing on-site child care services to the target population); they have also emerged from the perceptions of the students themselves (users and potential users of on-site child care services) regarding their own child care preferences and overall needs.

One of the most significant results of this project is the finding that prospective students are fairly similar to current students in all respects except three: employment, awareness of available child care services, and use of child care services. A substantially larger segment of prospective students than current students are employed, which may explain the preference of the majority of prospective students to attend classes in the evenings when they do return to school. The child care arrangements used by prospective students (for work-related or other purposes) tend to be more intra-family in nature than those used by current students (for school attendance purposes) and prospective students are generally less aware than are current students of the range of child care services available to them if they should return to school. Although they are less aware of what exists and less apt to be using extra-family types of care, prospective students, when informed of on-site child care services, show substantial interest in this form of child care. A majority (64%) of the prospectives sampled indicated that they would use on-site child care services if they were available.

Among both current and prospective students, strong preferences for intra-family types of child care arrangements such as care by a family member or relative were expressed. However, there was also a widespread openness to the idea of on-site child care, even among those who had never used it and who were not aware of its existence. Despite evidence that traditional, intra-family child care preferences and attitudes continue to prevail in our society, on-site (or campus) child care seems to hold a special appeal for many respondents who might otherwise avoid institutional, formal types of child care arrangements.

This form of child care elicited the highest level of satisfaction among all of the arrangements actually used by respondents. The most important reason given for preferring and/or using on-site child care is that the child is physically near the parent during the day. This explanation appears to be closely tied to intra-family preferences. Its appeal also stems from the perception of students and prospective students that this form of child care provides dependable and convenient quality care by a professional caregiver at a reasonable cost, as well as socialization and learning experiences for the child. A comparison of users and nonusers of on-site child care services revealed that many of the students using these services are traveling substantial distances from home to school and prefer to take their child with them to school rather than make arrangements closer to home. This finding differs from the staff perceptions obtained from the institutional survey that students living at some distance from the school preferred arrangements closer to home. Although the interest in campus child care was greatest among women with children in the 2 1/2 - 5 age group, a strong preference for this type of care was also expressed by mothers of younger children, and some interest was shown in this form of child care for older, school-aged children.

Over 21 percent of the currently enrolled students responding to this survey are users of on-site child care services. Compared with nonusers, users of on-site child care services as a group tend to be full-time day students with children in the 2 1/2 - 5 age group, who do not have another adult or older child in the home available to provide child care _when_ _needed_. Users also tend to be younger, have lower family incomes and are less apt to be employed than nonusers. It should be observed that the profile of the user of on-site child care services may be shaped by the availability of these services. Since campus child care was available only during the day, users would have to be day students rather than evening students. Daytime school attendance precludes full-time employment during the day, and those who are unemployed or who work part-time will tend to have lower incomes than those who are employed full-time. Users are more likely to have children in the 2 1/2 - 5 age group because on-site child care centers tend to be designed to serve this age group rather than younger or school-aged children.

It should also be noted that many respondents who do not fall within the description of the user of on-site child care services are nonetheless interested in this form of child care when informed of its existence. A full 34 percent of nonusers of on-site child care at campuses where these services are provided were _not_ aware that these services existed.

This information, coupled with widespread perceptions of child care needs as an actual or potential barrier to class attendance, holds important implications for schools considering or already operating on-site child care centers. Current and prospective students need to be informed about the existence and features of these services. Schools should also be aware of the kinds of student child care needs that are not always being met by existing campus child care centers, needs that may actually stand in the way of use. Outstanding among these requirements are: all-day availability, care for infants and toddlers, and evening care if classes for adults are scheduled primarily in the evening.

The Phase One institutional survey revealed that some of the agencies offering occupational education to adults have significantly fewer female students with children under the age of 12 than others. This is particularly true of the BOCES where programs for the adult population are offered mainly in the evening. The factor most frequently identified by all agencies as an incentive for establishing an on-site child care center is substantial interest and need on the part of students. The factor most frequently identified as a barrier to establishing an on-site child care center is insufficient funds. It would appear that if substantial student need is perceived, there will be increased support among faculty and administration for on-site child care. With institutional support and approval, funds and other resources for the establishment and continued operation of a child care center are more likely to be made available resulting in increased program access for adults with child care responsibilities.

Despite a limited target population at some of the sites surveyed in Phase One of the project, certain implications for local and State planning can be drawn from this study. Although the current adult student population and current program offerings at the BOCES do not generally appear to warrant the provision of on-site child care services during the day, it is possible that the availability of such services in the evening, coupled with publicity about its availability, would encourage more women with young children to enroll in BOCES programs and courses.

Adult occupational education enrollments in general have increased dramatically in the last 10 - 15 years, in contrast to the relative lack of growth and projected decline in enrollments at the secondary and postsecondary levels. In New York State alone, adult enrollments increased from 29,000 in 1965 to 160,000 in 1978. With an increased emphasis on the multi-needs of returning adults who are seeking occupational training or retraining, all schools and centers providing occupational education programs should be aware of the following:

- child care needs have been identified (by 54 - 60% of the students sampled) as a significant barrier to program access for women with children under 12;
- a majority of the current and prospective students sampled are generally favorable to on-site child care, even though their first preference is care by a family member, relative or friend;
- many students indicate that the availability of on-site child care would encourage them to take more courses; this is supported by the profile of on-site users who tend to carry a heavier course load and who attend more days per week than nonusers; and
- if on-site child care services are provided, a special effort is needed to inform prospective and current students of its availability and special features.

It is possible that a sizeable segment of the women with children who return or who wish to return to school for occupational education programs will continue to use intra-family types of child care arrangements if these are available to them. However, judging from the prevailing perception of child care needs as a barrier to program access, and from the general favorability toward on-site child care, a population exists that can and should be served.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Educational Resources Information Center

Angrist, S.S. & Lave, J.R. Economic, Social, and Policy Aspects of Child Care: A Quantitative Analysis of Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers. Pittsburgh, Pa: Carnegie-Mellon University, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 096 017)

Arkansas State Department of Education. Differential Day Care Placement Project. Final Narrative Report. Little Rock, Arkansas: Arkansas State Department of Education, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ER 121 464)

Frost, J. & Schneider, H. Types of Day Care and Parents' Preferences. Final Report: Part VII. Minneapolis, Minn: Institute for Interdisciplinary Studies, 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 068 195)

Greenblatt, Bernard & Eberhard, Lois. Children on Campus: A Survey of Pre-Kindergarten Programs at Institutions of Higher Education in the United States. Buffalo, New York: State University of New York Research Foundation at Buffalo, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 088 608)

Holloman, J.W. & Zaccaria, M.A. Opinions on Day Care and Social Policy. New Orleans: 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 138 355)

Jelfo, D.T. & Burger, V.K. Equality of Opportunity for Participation of Women in Higher Education through Child Care Services. Nova University, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 121 371)

Kelman, E. & Staley, B. The Returning Woman Student: Needs of an Important Minority on College Campuses. Ft. Collins, Colorado: Colorado State University, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 103 747)

Keyserling, M.D. Windows on Day Care: A Report on the Findings of Members of the National Council of Jewish Women on Day Care Needs and Services in Their Communities. New York: 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 063 027)

Los Angeles Community College District. Campus Children's Centers Sample Proposal. Los Angeles, Calif.: Los Angeles Community College, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 086 283)

Mellott, R.R. Regional Study of Day Care Services in Community Colleges. Lorain: Lorain Community College, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 121 371)

Page, P. & Kolleas, K. Campus Day Care: Issues and Resources. New York: 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 059 767)

Richards, L. S. Meeting the Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Women: A Program for Re-entry. 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 104 495)

Ruderman, F. A. Child Care and Working Mothers: A Study of Arrangements Made for Daytime Care of Children. New York: 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 045 175)

Schletzer, V. M., And Others. Continuing Education for Women, a Five-year Report of the Minnesota Plan. Minneapolis, Minn.: Minnesota University, 1967. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 012 430)

Taines, B. First Semester of the Diablo Valley College Women's Re-entry Program, Fall 1972, and a Program for Women at Diablo Valley College. Pleasant Hill, Calif.: Diablo Valley College, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 087 512)

Tucker, M. K. & Zell, L. C. Day Care Arrangements of Low Income Single Parents. Cleveland, Ohio: Cleveland State University, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 118154)

Westinghouse Learning Corporation. Day Care Survey - 1970. Summary Report and Basic Analysis. Rockville, Md.: 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 051 880)

Government Documents: Federal

Epstein, M. F. & Jennings, C. L. Child Care: Arrangements and Costs. Published Report of U.S. Department of Agriculture, Fall 1979.

Low, Seth & Spindler, Pearl. Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in the United States. Published Report of USDHEW Children's Bureau, 1968.

Shoffner, S. M. Child Care in Rural Areas: Needs, Attitudes, and Preferences. Published Report of U.S. Department of Agriculture, Fall 1979.

U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Daytime Care of Children: October 1974 and February 1975. Published Report, Series P-20 No. 298, October 1976.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Estimates of the Population of New York Counties and Metropolitan Areas: July 1, 1977 (Revised) and 1978 (Provisional). Published Report, Series P-26, No. 78-32, September 1979.

United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Final Title IX Regulation Implementing Education Amendments of 1972. Published Report, July 1975.

United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Child Development, Head Start Bureau. Statistical Highlights from the National Child Care Consumer Study. Published Report No. OHDO 76-31096, 1976.

United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education. Rules and Regulations Relating to Sex Discrimination/Sex Bias/Sex Stereotyping Provisions of P.L. 94-482, Education Amendments of 1976, Title II - Vocational Education.

Government Documents: State

New York State Advisory Council on Vocational Education. Unpublished Report, 1977.

New York State Advisory Council on vocational Education. Unpublished Report, 1978.

New York State Department of Education. Summary of Education Amendments of 1976. P. L. 94-482. Unpublished Report, 1977.

New York State Department of Social Services. Recap of Permits Issued and Certificates Approved. Unpublished Report, November 1979.

New York State Senate Minority Task Force on Child Care. Day Care - Volume I. How We Care in New York State. Published Report, April 1978. Legislative Document No. 1978 N.Y.S.L.D. - S03216.

Journals and Books

AACJC Study: Women in Occupational Education. Community and Junior College Journal, April 1977, 47 (7), 28-30.

Auerbach, S. & Rivaldo, J. Rationale for Child Care Services: Programs vs. Politics. (vol. 1) New York: Human Services Press, Inc., 1975.

Billups, L. & Ernst, R. J. Necessity for Child Care. Community and Junior College Journal, April 1977, 47 (7), 44-46.

Cargill, G. H. Child Care on Campus. Young Children, January 1977, 32 (2), 20-23.

Cohen, A. M. College Responses to Community Demands. Washington: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Fandetti, D. V. Day Care in Working Class Ethnic Neighborhoods: Implications for Social Policy. Child Welfare, November 1976, 55 (9), 618-626.

Joffe, C. E. Friendly Intruders: Child Care Professionals Family Life. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1977.

Pierce, W. L. Who's Watching the Children. The American Educator, Spring 1979, 10-13.

Zimmer, R. Necessary Directions for Anthropological Research on Child Care in the United States. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, Fall 1979, 10 (3).

Reports

Dutchess County Child Development Committee. The Need for Day Care Services in Dutchess County. Published Report, Poughkeepsie, New York, June 1972.

Education Commission of the States. The Children's Needs Assessment Handbook. Published Report, Denver, Colorado, May 1976.

Hennepin County Office of Administrator. Day Care: Planning to Meet Community Needs. Published Report, Minneapolis, Minnesota, July 1971.

Office of the Vice Chancellor for Educational Services, State University of New York. Unpublished Survey of Campus Day Care Centers, Albany, New York, March 1979.

Zamoff, R.B. Guide to the Assessment of Day Care Services and Needs at the Community Level. Published Report of the Urban Institute, Washington D.C., July 1971.

Zamoff, R.B. & Lyle, J.R. Assessment of Day Care Services and Needs at the Community Level: Mt. Pleasant. Published Report of the Urban Institute, Washington D.C., November 1971.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024